

New Series

Volume VII, Number 28

October 1956

The Review of English Studies

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

NOV 28 1956

*A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language*

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Editors

PETER ALEXANDER
NORMAN DAVIS

Assistant Editor

JEAN ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

Fortunys Exiltree. A Study of <i>The Kingis Quair</i> . By John Preston	339
An Examination of some Claims for Ramism. By A. J. Smith	348
Milton's First Sonnet on his Blindness. By Harry F. Robins	360
Johnson's Contributions to the <i>Literary Magazine</i> . By D. J. Greene	367
Birds in the Poetry of Browning. By Thomas P. Harrison .	393

NOTES

The Auchinleck <i>Life of Adam and Eve</i> (A. J. Bliss) . . .	406
Historical Allusions in <i>Absalom and Achitophel</i> (E. S. de Beer)	410

REVIEWS, ETC.:

English Historical Documents, Vol. I, edited by Dorothy Whitelock, 416;
The English Church in the Fourteenth Century, by W. A. Pantin, 418;
Shakespeare. Spokesman of the Third Estate, by Lorentz Eckhoff, 420;
King John, edited by E. J. Honigmann (Arden Shakespeare), 421; Studies

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; R. W. CHAPMAN; H. B. CHARLTON; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR WALTER GREG; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; A. W. REED; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC. (*cont.*):

in Elizabethan Drama, by Percy Simpson, 423; Tragicomedy: its origin and development in Italy, France, and England, by Marvin T. Herrick, 427; Anti-Puritan Satire 1572-1642, by William P. Holden, 429; John Gay. *Social Critic*, by Sven M. Armens, 432; Samuel Johnson's *Parliamentary Reporting*, by Benjamin Beard Hoover, 433; *The George Eliot Letters*, Vols. I-III, edited by Gordon S. Haight, 435; *The Unmediated Vision. An Interpretation of Wordsworth, Hopkins, Rilke, and Valéry*, by Geoffrey H. Hartman, 436; *Poetry and Dogma*, by Malcolm Mackenzie Ross, 437; *Short Notices*, 439; *Summary of Periodical Literature*, by A. Macdonald, 441; *List of Publications Received*, 445; *Index*, 447.

FORTUNYS EXILTREE: A STUDY OF THE KINGIS QUAIR

By JOHN PRESTON

Eke quho may in this lyfe have more plesance,
Than cum to largess from thraldom and peyne,
And by the mene of luffis ordinance,
That has so mony in his goldin cheyne?

I

MOST of the comment on *The Kingis Quair* has centred on the question of its authorship. The implication has been that the use of autobiographical material puts the poem on a different footing from other medieval love poems. Even C. S. Lewis, whose account can only lead to fuller understanding and appreciation, takes this view: 'the literal narrative of a contemporary wooing emerges from romance and allegory. It is the first modern book of love.'¹ How fundamentally misleading this approach is becomes clear from the more extended statement by W. Mackay Mackenzie:

Significant for the *Quair* are its departures from the traditional treatment of the theme of courtly love. This is no old-world story, like *Troilus and Criseyde*, but one of contemporary life, in which the personages could actually be identified. Nor is it of the so favoured allegorical class, in which not men and women, but the personifications of their desires, impulses, fears, manners, etc., are the actors on the stage of a dream. The dream in the *Quair* is incidental to the narrative not its framework, and the lovers are flesh and blood.²

This is certainly wide of the mark. The significance of the poem is that it does not depart at all in essentials from the courtly love tradition. It is certainly no 'old-world story' (nor, of course, is *Troilus*); on the other hand its characters are no more contemporary and identifiable than, say, Blanche or the man in black.

The Kingis Quair must be read with the allegorical tradition in mind. Interest then shifts from the romantic narrative to the way in which this answers the needs of the poem's developing thought. Personal experience illuminates general problems; a philosophy of life is achieved by meeting and resolving personal predicaments. Many levels and kinds of experience from the reading of Boethius to the playing out of a romantic adventure

¹ *The Allegory of Love* (Oxford, 1936), p. 237.

² W. M. Mackenzie, ed., *The Kingis Quair* (London, 1939), p. 37.

are combined in the poem. That James achieved this is due not so much to any unusual poetic gift as to the fact that he wrote in so strong and rich a tradition.

II

This is not to say that he left that tradition unmodified. When Chaucer uses the dream allegory, for instance, he seems to be unaware of what is happening. He seems to leave the reader to work out for himself the pattern that makes a whole of the separate parts of his poem, the reading, the allegorical visions, and so forth. He poses as a person through whom the truth is for a moment revealed and then, except for a cryptic record which even he does not properly understand, lost again. At the end of the *Parlement of Foules* he returns to perplexity and the barren search for understanding:

I wok, and othere bokes tok me to
To reede upon, and yit I rede alway. (ll. 695-6)

The uselessness of this earnest endeavour stresses that the poet is to cultivate an alert passivity so that he may be ready when the moment comes to record faithfully what he is shown. His guide in the *Parlement of Foules* says to him,

And if thow haddest connyng for t'endite,
I shal the shewe mater of to wryte. (ll. 167-8)

We shall see how at the end of *The Kingis Quair* James uses the traditional return to an unsatisfactory normal vision in a new and dramatically effective way. For the moment it is necessary to see that James also brings a new attitude to the co-ordinating pattern of the poem. Instead of insisting on his unconsciousness of imaginative structure he is very much alive to the interrelation of the different parts of the poem. He consciously manipulates the Chaucerian technique, using it as a method to express something already fully apprehended rather than an attitude of mind necessary to the peculiar sort of investigation he is making. This does not mean that James could have presented his full and complex meaning better or even as well in any other way. Yet the greater sophistication in his work is apparent at once: the reading of the book focuses his attention, not on the thoughts by which he is at present disturbed, but on the memory of those that are now past and overcome. The poem is in fact wholly retrospective; it is to tell 'what befell' the poet; it is to be concerned with the development from childhood to maturity of an individual. In the early stages of the poem James weaves together two strands of meaning (the comment on Boethius and on his own state of mind as a boy) and adds yet another (the difficulty of writing about it all) to produce a closeness of texture typical of the whole. This increased density in the imaginative scheme does not obscure three

main divisions roughly corresponding to the normal divisions of the dream allegory. The first is concerned with the reading of the book; the second deals with the poet's own experience, which in this case takes the form of a narrative about his early life; the third part, still in the form of a reminiscence, is an account of the dream in which the problems posed by his early experience were resolved.

The reading in Boethius is used partly to introduce James's narrative and partly to establish the themes to be dealt with in the poem. Mackenzie explains this opening sequence as an account of a fate opposite to James's own:

This leads him to meditate upon the uncertainty of fortune and his own experience, the reverse of that which his noble author had suffered at her hands . . . after a calamitous beginning he is now a happy man, in contrast with Boece, whose fate had gone the opposite way.¹

A more careful reading of the text is clearly necessary. What chiefly concerns the poet is not Boethius's misfortune but the way in which he overcame it: 'how he, in his poetly report, / In philosophy can him to comfort' (st. 4). This history is introduced as an exact parallel to James's own experience: 'nature', he says, 'gave me suffisance in youth' (st. 16) but Fortune became his foe before he was out of this 'tender youth'—his first knowledge of love, that is, brought only 'axis and turment' (st. 67)—and he gained final relief by coming to understand (as Boethius did) the part played by Fortune in the scheme of things. The only difference is that Boethius spoke generally of all experience, whilst James limits his account to the particular experience of love. But James implies all through the poem that this is central to life and that with the full understanding of it goes the understanding of the rest of life; and this view leads to the beautiful restatement of the values of courtly love in Venus's speech, where they are closely related to the divine and natural laws.

For the moment, however, Boethius's history is necessary to help James to arrive at a full consciousness of the issues involved in his experience. Until his reading brought them to the surface there was nothing in what had happened to him that he needed or was able to communicate. It is the Boethian pattern that suggests the pattern his own life has taken: 'I shal the shewe mater of to wryte.'

Further, it is important to note that Boethius's recovery was attained precisely through an acceptance of his misfortune: 'in tham' (his misfortune, poverty, and distress) he 'set his verray sekerness' (his true security). This was only possible because his character was based on a virtuous youth;

¹ *The Kingis Quair*, pp. 18-19.

from it he derived the strength to abandon the 'unsekir warldis appetitis' which alone could make exile distressful:

And so aworth he takith his penance,
And of his vertew maid it suffisance. (st. 6)

James's reflections on the security born of insecurity, the happiness discovered through distress, are clearly meant to be supported by the centrally important discussion of Fortune in the *De Consolatione*. In referring us to the source of his ideas he is also able to imply a fuller and more formal statement of them than he is able to afford at this stage in the poem:

For I deme that contrarious Fortune profiteth more to men than Fortune debonayre. For alwey, whan Fortune semeth debonayre, thanne sche lieth, falsly byhetyng the hope of welefulnesse; but forsothe contraryous Fortune is alwey sothfast, whan sche scheweth hirself unstable thurw hir chaungynge.

Whoso it be that is cleer of vertu, sad and wel ordynat of lyvyng, that hath put under fote the proude weerdes and loketh, upright, upon either fortune, he may holden his chere undesconfited.¹

James has invited the reader's attention to this conception, but he now shelves it for the moment and turns to a more commonplace view of uncertainty and insecurity; 'that eche estate, / As fortune lykith, thame will translate' (st. 8). But the general comment is an introduction to James's own history. The threat is greater to the young man; the happiness of youth is not certainly assured; it is an illusory well-being founded on inexperience and immaturity and unable to survive the giddy reverses of chance:

Thus stant thy confort in unsekerness,
And wantis it that suld the reule and gye:
Ryght as the schip that sailith stereles
Upon the rok(kis) most to harmes hye,
For lak of it that suld bene hir supplye. (st. 15)

'I mene this by myself as in partye', James continues; and it is obvious that the images he chooses relate to his own narrative. What is perhaps more important is that it also recalls Boethius's language:

Allas how the thought of man, dreynt in overthrowng depnesse, dulleth and forleteth his propre clernesse, myntyng to gon into foreyne dirknesses as ofte as his anoyos bysynes waxeth withoute mesure, that is dryven to and fro with werldly wyndes.²

What is more, the image turns out to be relevant not only to his experience as a youth but also to his sense of unfitness for the imaginative labour.

¹ Chaucer, ed. Robinson (Boston and Oxford, 1933), *Boece*, ii, Pr. 8. 12-20; i, Met. 4. 1-5.

² Ibid. i, Met. 2. 1-7.

This is a synthesis which should reveal at once the inadequacy of any approach attaching importance only to the literal historical fact. An account of the narrative which forms the second part of the poem will show to what extent it has the force of symbol and contributes to the whole imaginative scheme.

III

In the attempt to trace the gradual achievement of some final stability in which human experience will no longer seem disturbing or perplexing, the personal narrative is used to give immediacy and realism. And yet the narrative at once reveals itself as an allegorical as well as a literal statement; the metaphorical pattern already established is now fused with the story in a highly assured interpenetration of dramatic realism and symbolism:

With mony 'fare wele' and 'Sanct Iohne to borowe'
 Off falowe and frende; and thus with one assent
 We pullit up saile, and furth oure wayis went.
 Upon the wawis weltering to and fro,
 So infortunate was us that fremyt day, . . .
 [that] Off inymyis takin and led away
 We weren all, and broght in thair contree;
 Fortune it schupe non othir wayis to be. (sts. 23-24)

The subsequent account of his imprisonment brings us to the central image of impotence proceeding from inexperience. Till now the youth has been 'like to the bird that fed is on the nest / And can noght flee' (st. 14); now he finds himself aware of a fuller life and yet still unable to participate in it:

The bird, the beste, the fisch eke in the see,
 They lyve in fredome everich in his kynd;
 And I a man, and lakkith libertee. (st. 27)

This refers to something more than the physical imprisonment; from his window the poet can look into the garden where the nightingale sings of love and the birds rejoice that they have won their mates. But, 'as it semyt to a lyf without, / The bewis spred the herber all about' (st. 32); the boughs still hide the garden from view; knowledge of love is still denied and there is still incredulity:

Quhat lyf is this, that makis birdis dote? . . .
 It is nothing, trowe I, bot feynit chere,
 And that men list to counterfeten chere. (st. 36)

This, with its echoes of Troilus's taunts at love and the easily vulnerable immaturity that produced them, makes it clear that whatever the possibility of James's narrative being literally true it is here offered primarily as a

typical courtly love situation. Without sacrificing anything of its dramatic realism James has made the episode a perfect image of still adolescent and unfocused feelings about love.

But the image of imprisonment soon settles into the more conventional thralldom of the courtly love poem; when he first sees the lady his heart at once confesses complete subjection to her. Professor Lewis rightly notices 'the beautiful oxymoron'—'my hert become hir thrall / For ever of free wyll' (st. 41)—in which the poet is able 'to feel and to express both sides of the complex experience';¹ indeed throughout the account there is a keen awareness of the complexity of the situation. The experience comes at first as a release; the voluntary submission to the lady substitutes for the imprisonment which had isolated him one by which he can express all the new wonder and devotion he feels. This thralldom is not a restraint: 'ar ye god Cupidis owin princesse, / And cummyn ar to lous me out of band?' (st. 43). Yet this new experience brings in a new form the same feelings as before; he is still without sure knowledge, though not now without an object on which his desires may centre:

Quhat sall I think, allace! quhat reverence
Sall I minster to your excellence? (st. 43)

And lastly the new feelings of delight only heighten the consciousness of restraint; he falls back into 'bewailling myn infortune and my chance' (st. 45).

The passage which follows describing the lady calls for no such delicate balance of responses. It presents an image of sharp and brilliant detail, a beautiful expression of newly-awakened perceptions, but it is considerably less interesting and structurally less closely relevant than the preceding passage. The adoration and homage which do not find clear expression here are better conveyed by the restlessness, the delicately comic agitation of the poet's call to the nightingale:

Opyn thy throte; hastow no lest to sing?
Allace! sen thou of resoun had felyng,
Now, suete bird, say ones to me 'pepe';
I dee for wo; me think thou gynnys slepe. (st. 57)

The language here, unpretentious living speech, is in direct contrast to the elaborate stiffness of the description. In the superb sixtieth stanza the real strength and flexibility of this language become apparent; at the end of this stanza the humour with its critical balance gives way to a tenderness and eagerness in 'Bot blawe wynd, blawe, and do the levis schake' which recall the naked feeling of 'Western wind, when will thou blow?' The

¹ Op. cit., p. 236.

increase in emotional pressure at this point, associated with the return to a more popular, less sophisticated tradition,¹ occurs at the crisis of the poem; the progress from immaturity and ignorance to understanding has reached the point of the first perception of love and its power; and this brings only a clearer perception of powerlessness and a more disturbing doubt:

So sore thus sight I with myself allone,
 That turnyt is my strenth in febilness,
 My wele in wo, my frendis all in fone,
 My lyf in deth, my lyght into dirkness,
 My hope in feer, in dout my sekirness,
 Sen sche is gone: and Gode mote hir convoye,
 That me may gyde to turment and to joye! (st. 71)

The only way out of the tangle of paradoxes is by the dreams that cut right through it and lead to the final clarification and understanding.

IV

The dream is described, appropriately, as a release: 'and sone, me thocht, furth at the dure in hye / I went my weye, nas nothing me ageyne' (st. 75). In the 'cloude of cristall clere and fair' all things are seen for what they are and in an orderly relationship. Surveying the whole range of love experience the poet is able to test his limited personal knowledge of love against a new and complete knowledge; and this is the right moment for a redefinition of courtly love which Venus herself supplies in reply to the poet's cry for mercy.

Venus seems to offer only another paradox:

Sen of my grace I have inspirit the
 To knawe my lawe, contynew furth, for oft,
 There as I mynt full sore, I smyte bot soft. (st. 105)

But there is a reminder here of what Boethius learnt about Fortune: 'whan Fortune semeth debonayre, thanne sche lieth, falsly byhetyng the hope of welefulnesse.' What Philosophy says of Fortune in the *De Consolatione* could also apply to Love:

Thou hast bytaken thiself to the governaunce of Fortune and forthi it byhoveth the to ben obeisaunt to the maneris of thi lady.²

Love and Fortune are seen to be closely linked; their behaviour is

¹ See the parallels to 'Western wind' quoted by E. K. Chambers and F. Sidgwick in *Early English Lyrics* (London, 1937), p. 340.

² Boece, ii, Pr. 1. 119.

puzzling and contrarious in similar ways, the influence of both of them is finally unavoidable and the way to understand them both is simply to experience them fully. That this law of Love or Fortune is taken to be universal is made clear by the myth in which Venus's concern for the lives of men is associated with the natural and divine laws; she describes how, as a token of her weeping, 'cummyth all this reyne, / That ye se on the ground so fast ybete' (st. 116). And the flowers that are watered by her tears 'preyen men, in thair flouris wis, / Be trewe of lufe and worschip my servis' (st. 117). Obedience to the laws of nature means a recognition of the divine law, and the culmination of the whole argument is to be seen in the beautiful stanza 123:

This is to say, contynew in my servis,
Worschip my law, and my name magnifye,
That am your hevin and your paradis.

The definition of courtly love as truly both amorous and divine is a necessary stage in the poetic account of an increasing fullness of understanding and emotional stability.

The final stage is the encounter with Fortune herself when these laws are brought to the test of actual experience. The poet has emphasized throughout that the living and testing of the forces present in life, and not merely their rational acceptance, are of the greatest importance. What matters is the direction given to living and not the formulation of a philosophy. For this reason the direct recommendation to trust in God, to 'Tak him before in all thy governance, / That in his hand the stere has of you all' (st. 130), in spite of its close links with the imagery of the opening of the poem, carries little weight as opposed to the imaginative fusion of values in stanza 123 and the allegory of the encounter with Fortune. After the vision in which the poet seems to be drawn at last into a complete community with the law of kind, the poem proceeds to the brusque comedy of Fortune's wheel:

'Now hald thy grippis,' quod sche, 'for thy tyme,
Ane hour and more it rynnys ouer prime;
To count the hole, the half is nere away;
Spend wele, therefore, the remanant of the day.
. . . Fare wele,' quod sche, and by the ere me toke
So earnestly, that therwithall I woke. (sts. 171-2)

There is nothing conventional about this; the language has the vitality that really fuses comedy and seriousness; the end of a spiritual pilgrimage can be described in near-farcical terms.

v

James uses the conventional reawakening sequence of the dream poem as a dramatic device, delaying the moment of final understanding:

Though that my spirit vexit was tofore,
In suevyng, alssone as ever I woke,
By twenti fold it was in trouble more
Bethinking me with sighing hert and sore,
That nan othir thingis bot dremes had,
Nor sekernes, my spirit with to glad. (st. 174)

But it is the disillusion not the dream which is illusory; a few stanzas later comes the sudden and unexpectedly easy release as the turtle-dove alights on his hand, 'off quham the chere in hir birdis apert / Gave me in hert kalendis of confort' (st. 177).

'Thankit be fortunys exiltree / And quhile, that thus so wele has quhirlit me' (st. 189). If the poet has found personal stability it has been through acquiescence in the changing pattern of life; 'verray welefulnesse' (in Boethius's phrase) consists in knowing life for what it is and accepting it:

Enforcestow the to aresten or withholden the swyftnesse and the sweigh of hir [Fortune's] turnynge wheel? O thow fool of alle mortel foolis! Yif Fortune bygan to duelle stable, she cessede thanne to ben Fortune.¹

This conclusion has only been made possible by the imaginative discipline of the dream allegory with its possibilities of organizing and even synthesizing diverse experiences. The narrative, which may or may not be an historical fact, furnishes the basic symbols for a new exploration of the courtly love code and its relations to religion and life. The distinction of the poem lies in the developing meaning of the whole work, not in the romantic story at its core.

¹ Boece, ii, Pr. 1. 121.

AN EXAMINATION OF SOME CLAIMS FOR RAMISM

By A. J. SMITH

IT was perhaps with a sense—certainly justified—that the old clever nostrums of 'Metaphysical' criticism had had their day, that scholars welcomed in 1947 the revolutionary evidence concerning the effects of sixteenth-century rhetoric massively presented by Professor Tuve in her *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery*. Other American voices, of great authority, had then been urging for some time the general literary importance of this or that aspect of the contemporary academic disciplines. In these writings one name recurs as likely to be of prime moment, that of the inaugurator of certain reforms in the organization of the disciplines, Peter Ramus. The Bartholomew martyr Ramus, thus resurrected with his disciple Talaeus and his devoted English following from his centuries of obscurity, is provided with a mighty progeny, if a posthumous one. We are told that we may hail him as a father of science, as the dispeller of frothy rhetoric, as the very matrix of the Metaphysical style. Ramus, declares Professor Hardin Craig, turned what had been in great part a theoretical science into a practical art; and his logic was a general force in the direction of the advancement of science.¹ Professor Perry Miller finds that it was the 'inescapable tendency' of Ramism towards the divorce of thought from expression, content from style, which brought on the plain, toughly logical manner of preaching and the Puritan contempt for rhetoric, compelling poets to replace ornamental figures with knotty dialectical manœuvres.² For Miss Tuve, most detailed and, to the literary student, most important of these commentators, Ramism provides a satisfactory explanation not only of certain major elements in so-called 'Metaphysical' poetry, but even of the very thought processes of the greatest 'Metaphysical' poet, Donne.³ Yet, to turn to the work of the writers for whom these tremendous claims are made is to be disappointed, almost shocked. The cause they so fiercely championed seems, to the ordinary eye at least, much as it has seemed to the intervening centuries, puny, and dead.

Miss Tuve's chief arguments are briefly these:

(i) The Ramists brought logic and poetry into a peculiarly close relationship; so close, in fact, that for their disciples no distinction was possible between

¹ *The Enchanted Glass* (New York, 1936), p. 145.

² *The New England Mind* (New York, 1939), p. 327.

³ *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery* (Chicago, 1947), ch. xii.

poetry and dialectic. After Ramus, the poet was to be dialectician; and his imagery was to be dialectically functional as argument—'Decorative images would not be a desideratum, they would scarcely be a possibility'. These doctrines were powerfully urged by the Ramist method of illustrating the places and functions of logic from all the various types of writing, including poetry.

(ii) As a result of Ramus's readjustment of the traditional relationship of logic and rhetoric, whereby *Invention* and *Disposition* were to be taught by the logician alone, and only *Eloquence* by the rhetorician, the 'rhetor', or the poet, would be a logician 'in the first stages of composition'.

(iii) 'The old separation between demonstrative and deliberative "orations"' had gone 'into the discard, and with it the conception it preserved of different structures and ornament for differing purposes, in lyrics.' These old demonstrative and deliberative intentions 'pretty well cover the lyrical output of earlier years'; but after Ramus all pieces were to have, alike, 'a dialectical base'.

(iv) The omission of the discussion of special types of oration from the bare Ramist handbooks amounts to a denial that there could be differing functions of oratory needing differing methods. The orator or other writer is now impelled to 'declare reasons and causes, to examine the nature of something, to consider from various sides, to figure out, look into, mull over'. This is 'precisely what most Metaphysical poems do', and the process is bound to be accompanied by the 'deliberate use of intellectually acute and strong images'. One 'comes out with the description of a Metaphysical poem' if one adds to this two more Ramist concepts: (a) dialectically sound statements 'prove', that is, 'argue the truth or advisability of something': (b) 'images (tropes, concretions, metaphorical epithets, descriptions, definitions) are "arguments"'.

(v) The result of the notion that images are 'arguments' was that 'The nature of their terms might range from the most subtle of abstractions to the most ordinary of daily objects', and that their chief characteristics would include subtlety, logical power, ingenious or startlingly precise relationships or parallels, 'a certain "obscurity" due to logical complexity or tenuous attachment—but an obscurity capable of becoming sharp "clarity" upon thoughtful reading'.

One would be happy to augment with such weighty authority one's own conviction that Donne's processes of thought are better explained by the intellectual conditions of his own day than by 'any of the current popular phrases about "feeling his thought"'. But the traditional teaching explains much; and even preliminary scrutiny in the light of that teaching indicates that these large claims for Ramism are not all justified.

Ramism. One has to search hard in sixteenth-century English literature to find any considerable mention of Ramus and Ramism.¹ Ascham, in his *Scholemaster*, curtly dismissed Ramus and his henchman Talaëus. The proselytizing Ramist Abraham Fraunce claimed that he had interested

¹ There is a brief account in the introduction to Dr. Ethel Seaton's edition of Fraunce's *The Arcadian Rhetorike* (Luttrell Society Reprints 9), pp. ix-xii.

Sidney in the movement.¹ In 1576 de Banos dedicated his life of Ramus to Sidney, remarking that Sidney 'not only loved Ramus as a father when alive, but esteemed and revered him after death'.² That Sidney's interest in Ramus continued is suggested by William Temple's dedication to him in 1584 of his *P. Rami Dialecticae Libri duo*. Temple afterwards became Sidney's secretary. Marlowe gave Ramus, notable victim, and Talaeus, a brief scene in *The Massacre at Paris*: that is, in an event which took place when Talaeus had been dead for twenty years. A number of obscure Puritans, forerunners of one less obscure, John Milton, produced translations or expositions of Ramus—Dudley Fenner, 'M.R.M. Scotum', 'R.F.', Alexander Richardson. Cambridge, indeed, is assumed to have welcomed the Ramist reorganization of rhetoric and logic; and this seems possible by reason both of the Cambridge connexions of several of the names quoted and of the undoubted fact that Gabriel Harvey was publicly advocating the reform there in the mid fifteen-seventies.³ But if, as is said, Ramist innovations had so far ousted traditional teaching by the beginning of the new century that they could be certainly counted as influences on later writers, how curiously anomalous was the experience of that Ramist writer who in 1632 spoke of the suppression of a first volume of translation from Ramus, and of the 'storms of reproch and ignomie' that he expected for his new one!⁴

The typical Ramist logic or rhetoric might have a good deal of disputatious matter on the nature of an Art, and the imperfections of its assailants, but the characteristic of its didactic section was brevity. Only a skeleton system was given. In the logics *Invention* and *Disposition* were ruthlessly abridged, and explained with little more than a few illustrations from popular classical authors, or from the Scriptures. The Rhetorics of Talaeus and Fraunce, shorn by Ramus's decree of *Invention* and *Disposition*, treat only the schemes and tropes, and their authors proceed in the same stark fashion as the logicians, merely giving the figure with the briefest of descriptions and illustrations. The removal of the first two parts of traditional rhetoric was another economy, recognized as artificial. *Invention* and *Disposition* were to belong 'not to Rhetorike for doctrine, but onely for use' as Alexander Richardson revealingly put it.⁵

¹ *The Lawiers Logike* (London, 1588), Prefatory Letter. Mr. John Buxton suggests that Sidney's influence led Fraunce to study Ramus (*Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* (London, 1954), p. 147). But Fraunce unequivocally describes himself as Sidney's instructor, both in logic and in Ramism.

² Buxton, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

³ Orations *The Rhetor* and *Ciceronianus*, delivered in 1575 and 1576 respectively. See *Ciceronianus*, ed. H. S. Wilson and C. A. Forbes (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1945), pp. i-vii; and H. S. Wilson, 'Gabriel Harvey's Orations on Rhetoric', *ELH.*, xii (1945), 167-82.

⁴ 'R.F.', *Peter Ramus, his Logick* (London, 1632), A2^r-A3^v.

⁵ *The Logicians School-Master: or a Comment Upon Ramus Logicke* (London, 1629), p. 241.

These peculiarities of the Ramist system are explained by two circumstances. Firstly, there is Ramus's notion of what constitutes an Art—it is simply a body of precepts properly organized and systematized in good teaching order, 'a Methodicall disposition of true and coherent precepts, for the more easie perceiving and better remembring of the same'.¹ This notion issued in three fundamental axioms or *Documents*. I quote them from the translation of 'M.R.M. Scotum':

... three generall documentes to be observed in all artes and sciences. The first is that all the preceptes and rules should be generall and of necessitie true: and this is called a documente of veritie: The seconde that every arte be contained within his owne boundes, and witholde nothing appartaining to other artes, and is named a documente of iustice. The third, that every thing be taught according to his nature, that is: generall thinges generally: and particuler, particularly: and this is called a documente of wysdome.²

The consistent application of these principles throughout the teaching of any Art was what the Ramists meant by a second canon, *Method*—the reduction of all Arts to their bare and proper essentials for convenient teaching, and the treatment of general matters before particular, in the orderly disposing of the single discourse as much as in the whole educational system.

Logic and rhetoric were thus general Arts. Logic, indeed, gave *Method* to all the others, as 'the Art of Arts, the instrument of instrumentes, the hand of Philosophie'.³ Hence it would have been improper—an offence against the Document of Wisdom—for logic and rhetoric to pursue the aim of any one particular art, while on the other hand they were necessarily manifested in all particular arts. Despite occasional definitions of logic as *ars bene disserere*, the traditionalist bias towards the teaching of practical polemics was on the whole absent from Ramist systems, not because Ramists did not favour polemics but because teachers of general Arts had no business with them: 'Disserere, docere, disputare, are rather particular functions of Methode, than general operations of the whole art.'⁴ This, and not any theory about the methods of writing, or wish to reform writing, was the reason for the frequent protestations that logic was the property of all reasoning men, disputants and non-disputants alike. It was the reason, too, for the choice of illustrative material from popular literature which was obviously not written for the purpose of demonstration—'Now Logicke is a general Art, *ergo* it is best to fetch examples out of Poetry, &c which belongs to Rhetoricke a generall art.'⁵

¹ A. Fraunce, *The Lawiers Logike* (London, 1588), f. 2^v.

² *The Logike of P. Ramus* (London, 1574), p. 74.

³ A. Fraunce, *op. cit.*, f. 2^r.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 3^r.

⁵ A. Richardson, *op. cit.*, pp. 81–82.

As with logic, so with rhetoric: 'for Rhetorick is a generall arte, *ergo* it may be everie where'.¹ Particular Arts, such as oratory and writing, could not be a peculiar concern of rhetoric, and that great discipline was reduced to a trivial art of titivation, its task merely the making of any discourse eloquent. The features of oratory formerly taught by rhetoricians under *Invention* and *Disposition* were necessarily excluded. No account was given now of devices of persuasion, or of the use of the places of logic in the various kinds of oration. But these were purely formal changes. Ramists did not question the traditional notion that the orator is a popular persuader, who needs his own less stringent types of proof 'to leade the people, viz. the beast like heads of the multitude'.² 'The Orators attribute all to victory. Therefore this seemeth to be placed chiefly by them not so much to teach as to persuade.'³ And although logical *Disposition* could not treat of the types of the oration, as did the *Disposition* of traditional rhetoric, the Ramists manifestly continued to think of oratorical functions in terms of these traditional types and the methods and places associated with them. 'Explications, illustrations, amplifications, and extenuations are set from this place', says Fraunce of *Subject*:⁴ and of *Adjunct* even more significantly:

Here are also set prayes and disprayes, deliberations and consultations. Herein are contained also all those Rhetoricall places concerning the giftes and qualities of body and soul, as also externall and those of fortune.⁵

Ramus himself had pointed out in an aside on *Etimologie* that 'the use then of this place is, to prove or disprove, prayse or disprayse any thing by the Etimologie of it'.⁶ These, the special functions of the traditional oratorical types, had obviously not gone 'into the discard' for him.

What the Ramists did say under *Disposition* was very general. They plainly relied, as in other places, on a knowledge of the traditional systems, cavilling only because traditionalist rhetoricians taught them as their own — 'it doth not follow, that because the Rhetorician useth disposition, *ergo* it belongs to Rhetorike'.⁷ The principle of rhetorical decorum is admitted — 'As brevity is commended in a perfect definition, so copious amplification is fitted for a description: yet so as swelling superfluitie bee alwayes avoyded'.⁸ And the reader may be incidentally referred, though in very general terms, to kinds of oratory taught only in traditional rhetoric:

It shall be sufficient for us to follow a more easie and elegant kinde of disputation [than a speech to formal rules of axioms, syllogisms, and the rest] joyning Rhetorike with Logike, and referring that precise straitnesse unto Philosophical exercises.⁹

¹ A. Richardson, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

² 'R.F.', *op. cit.*, p. 106.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

⁴ *The Lawiers Logike*, ed. cit., f. 40^r.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 44^r.

⁶ 'M.R.M. Scotum', *op. cit.*, p. 54.

⁷ A. Richardson, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁸ Fraunce, *op. cit.*, f. 63^v.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 120^r.

There was no hint of any intention of replacing the traditional types of discourse with some one form, or of teaching a detailed method of discourse at all.

The figures of rhetoric, no longer devices of persuasion, were useful only as general helps in any kind of discourse, that is, as embellishment and garnishment, 'a certeine decking of speech, whereby the usual and simple fashion thereof is altered and changed to that which is more elegant and conceived'.¹ Rhetoric lost at once the many figures which had been quite explicitly tactics of disputation, and the traditional notion that style is an important article of persuasion. 'Now whatsoever hath affection to argue, that belongs to Logike.'² The probatory use of the similitude and its fellows went therefore to logic alone. But the few mentions of them that the Ramist reader would have found there were most unpractical compared with the instructions for the use of all the techniques of comparison in, say, *The Rule of Reason*, or *The Art of Reason*, rightly termed *Witcraft*, bare statements of the traditional view that things could be compared 'from the less, the aequall, and the more', with a number of quite unargumentative similes from *The Shepheardes Calender*, or some such, forced in as illustration. This really conveyed no notion at all of the use of analogy and simile in persuasion and proof, any more than it indicated the necessary traditionalist distinction between these popular arguments 'by example' and the strict syllogistic argument 'by rule'. So little were the Ramists concerned with particular practice.

The Ramists, then, had no new notion of style to put forward. All that was now remarkable was that the orator was to receive no special instruction from the rhetorician; that his methods were admitted, but never described in detail; and that if the 'proofs' formerly held to be popular, and proper to the orator's art, were treated at all, their impropriety for any other form of discourse was never indicated, nor were they distinguished practically from the more legitimate forms of proof. Practical interests were rigidly subordinated to strict theoretical consistency.

Ramus and verse. The Ramists had little to say of verse. They used poetic fragments, with other popular writings, to illustrate logical relations and arguments. Occasionally, though always incidentally, they revealed their views in direct comment. Miss Tuve has attempted to infer Ramus's intention concerning poetry from the Ramist habit of illustration. Explicit avowal and open show of opinion would surely be a more reliable guide, particularly since the views inferred are said to have been startlingly new.

¹ Id., *The Arcadian Rhetorike* (London, 1588), B8^r.

² Id., *The Lawiers Logike*, f. 72^r.

The Ramists used verse and other writings as illustrative material because, as Richardson tells us,

Logicke being a general Art, it is therefore best to fetch his examples out of the most common and general writers, as out of Poets and Historians, which the Gentiles and Turkes may receive, these being more generally knowne to the worlde, then are the Scriptures.¹

Poetry was to be taken in preference to anything else because it is 'more generally knowne to the world'. The aim professed was not, as Miss Tuve asserts, to establish an especially close relationship between verse and dialectic, but merely to illustrate in the most persuasive manner the dictum that Logic is a general Art. It was the strength of the Ramists' case that they could show all the logical relationships in the writing not of logicians or metaphysicians, but of non-technical reasonable men—writing which was not produced for the purpose but already existing and popular, such as the *Metamorphoses* and *The Shepheardes Calender* and the *Arcadia*. With Rhetoric, too, their aim was to prove that it was a general and not specifically a persuasive art; and accordingly all illustrations of the Schemes and Tropes were drawn from the most popular literature.

When Miss Tuve claims that the stream of Ramist illustration is sufficient to convince 'even the twentieth-century reader' that poetry and logic cannot 'be kept in separate compartments', she appears to have failed to distinguish between senses of the word 'logic'. It is not too much to say that this claim, with as much of her argument as depends upon it, is the product of linguistic confusion. 'Traditional' logic as it is now commonly understood, and as Miss Tuve plainly understands it, is the art of dialectics. As it was taught in the sixteenth century, however, logic was primarily analytic, the art whose concern was first and foremost the classification of matter according to the traditional Aristotelian categories, and only after that the disposition of the classified matter in modes of proof. When Ramists said that all reasonable discourse is necessarily logical, they meant simply that all writing must be about things—must refer to matter and its interrelationships: that all good writing will be well ordered; and that when, occasionally, discourse involves inference, the forms of inference will be found to be reducible to syllogistic moods. They certainly did not mean that all discourse must be argumentative, or full of tough reasoning processes and techniques of proof. On the contrary, embellishments and ornaments of style, without any argumentative function at all, would on this broad view of logic be thoroughly logical, since they all refer to matter and the relationships of matter.

¹ A. Richardson, *op. cit.*, pp. 81–82.

Miss Tuve's claim for Ramist illustration is in fact merely a truism. Not only Donne, but all the world's poets, have filled their verse with logic, in the sixteenth-century sense of that word. The verse illustrations themselves are insignificant; and in Ramus, indeed, only a small part of a body of quotation taken from a variety of sources, including the Scriptures and classical prose-writers. Here are a few such from Fraunce's *Lawiers Logike*, a work in which *The Shepheardes Calender* is used to demonstrate the features of logic:

(*Cause . . . Procreant*). Pan may bee proud that ever he begot such a bellibone.
April.

(*Material*). So in August Willy sheweth what matter his cup was made of, thus

Then lo, *Perigot*, the plege which I plight,
A mazer ywrought of the maple warre.

(*Of the whole, part, generall, speciall*). *Morell* in July, to enforce the general commendation of hils, bringeth in special examples, as Saint Michaels mount . . . &c.

(*Of the Adiunct*). In August *Perigot* describeth his bouncing Bellibone by hir attire.

(*Disparates*). Bring here the Pincke and purple Cullambine
With Gelliflowres
Bring Coronations, and sops in wine,
Worne of paramours:
Strow me the ground with Daffadownlillyes
And Cowslyps, and Kingcups, and loved Lillyes
The pretty Pounce
And the Chevisaunce,
Shall match with the fair Flowredelice.

All which herbes bee equally differing one from another, and are therefore Disparates.

(*Axioms*. Compound; congregative; copulative). *Thomalyn* in July.

But shepheard mought be meeke and milde,
well eyed, as *Argus* was.

(*Segregative, hypothetical disjunctive*). In September.

Diggon Davy I bid her good day,
Or *Diggon* her is, or I missay.

(*Syllogisme*. . . . Second kinde. Proper affirmative).

Ferio. O blessed sheepe, O shepheard great,
that bought his flocke so deare
And them did save with bloody sweat,
from wolves that would them teare.

Fe The great God Pan saved his flock with bloody sweat,
 ri Christ is the great God Pan.
 o Therefore Christ saved his flocke with bloody sweate.¹

'Surelie', says Stupido, pointedly named, in the St. John's play *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, 'Surelie in my . . . simple opinion, Mr. Peter maketh all things verie plaine and easie.'² This is plainly not writing for men already trained in the academic disciplines. It is beginners' stuff, and its purpose is at once to show the unschooled that logic is, simply, a necessity of all coherent discourse, and to display the categories and forms of logic in the form most easily remembered by them. In these crude Ramist illustrations the only form that the contemporary poet is not likely to have used habitually all his mature life is the one piece of pure logic, that Aristotelian quiddity, the syllogism. One need not ascribe to him a belief that syllogism is not proper to poetry. Fraunce's painful attempts to scrape examples of the syllogistic modes from quite unargumentative lines sufficiently demonstrate its intractability. But it has to be remembered, in fairness to the Ramists, that their system was not intended to revolutionize poetry, only to reform teaching—their concern was the best method of teaching their twin subjects, and to that end alone they reorganized them. Their writings seem naïve almost beyond belief if they are read in expectation of the revolutionary designs and reforms Miss Tuve attributes to Ramists at large, designs they never had and 'reforms' which were common-places. Yet without doubt such specimens as those quoted answered admirably the humbler purpose proposed.

Ramists did not concern themselves to parade their views about verse, but occasional side-references indicate only acceptance of traditional teaching and current notions. Poetry was still an offshoot of Rhetoric—'Poetry . . . which belongs to Rhetorike';³ and poets, like Orators, were allowed still a laxity improper in more learned Arts, being 'not bound so strictly to observe the perfection of the first methode'.⁴ They were feigners, teaching 'notable truths' by such Allegories as the story of Dido and Aeneas, and the fables of Aesop:

Now the Poets fall into many figments, but they meane thereby things, and so they belong to some speciall Arts: and all *Esops* Fables, and other fables, are but Allegories belonging to natural Philosophy, or to morall Philosophy.⁵

They were makers of sweet sounds, fine writers rather than sober and grave ones, by some patronized, by others held in contempt:

. . . and thus much of garnishings of speache by the measure of soundes, rather

¹ Ff. 12^r, 15^v, 35^r, 42^v, 47^r, 93^v–93^r, 96^v, 108^r.

² iii. 325, ed. Macray, p. 11. Fraunce was himself a St. John's man—a black sheep in that anti-Ramist fold.

⁴ Fraunce, *The Lawiers Logike*, f. 114^v.

³ Richardson, op. cit., p. 82.

⁵ Richardson, op. cit., p. 29.

to give some taste of the same to the Readers, then to drawe any to the curious and unnecessarie practise of it.¹

Even in Fraunce, the admirer of Spenser, one can detect the common note—verse is pleasant, but trivial:

Mary, quoth hee, thease fine University men have beene trained up in such easie, elegant, conceited, nice, and delicate learning, that they can better make new-found verses of Amyntas death, and popular discourses of Ensignes, Armory Emblems, Hieroglyphikes, and Italian Impreses, than apply their heads to the study of the Law, which is hard, harsh, unpleasant, unsavoury, rude and barbarous.²

Fraunce concludes his *Lawiers Logike* with the usual formal demonstration that the best authors in prose and verse have always observed strict method, on this occasion a tabular analysis of Virgil's Second Eclogue. His inconsistency would be monumental if he had been advocating revolutionary courses, for he carries into it all the notions about the aims and methods of oratory which had been current at any rate in the previous sixty years.

Like so much else in sixteenth-century writing, Ramist logic is too easily praised for innovations not its own, common notions and the traditional doctrines of rhetoricians. Mr. Miller's account of the effects of Ramism fatally ignores traditionalist teaching. The 'inescapable tendency' he detects to 'divorce thought from expression, to dis sever content from style' was inescapable only because it was the common assumption throughout the sixteenth century. Unless Mr. Miller means to imply that all non-Ramist writers subscribed to a Bradleian theory of the unity of thought and expression, he is surely saying no more than that the Ramist writer could control the number and quality of figures used in discourse, as others could not—he was committed to working out his sermon structure in terms of logic, and only thereafter going over his work to punctuate it with tropes or to cast sentences into schemes'. But the traditional system of the three styles depended largely upon this very ability, more figures to be added for one purpose, most to be taken away for another:

... thei be not partes of the matter, but eyther may be taken out, or quite left of:³

Careful analyses of bare structures, and continual reminders that 'arguments' were to be drawn from the places of logic, were in fact characteristic of non-Ramist works. In any event, it is difficult to see why it should be expected that a concentration on the handling of schemes and tropes would produce a total excision of all figurative embellishment. The opposite

¹ Dudley Fenner, *The Artes of Logike and Rhetorike* (Middleburgh, 1588), C6^v.

² *The Lawiers Logike*, ¶ 2.

³ R. Sherry, *The Figures of Grammar and Rhetorike* (London, 1555), f. lviii^r.

seems as likely, stylistic aberrations deriving from an excessive use of figures.

Miss Tuve's great claims, so powerfully urged, have no more substance. Ramus and the Ramists were not arguing or intending to argue that poetry and dialectic are the same, and their ends the same; indeed, to have maintained such a position would have been a denial of their fundamental tenets. The 'Ramist idea of a Unity of Arts of thought', which helps Miss Tuve to the discovery of the identity, is not readily discoverable in Ramus or the Ramists, unless it be revealed in such commonplace references as this:

Q. *Shew the force of this example.*

A. Art is the genus, Poesie and eloquence the species.¹

It was, moreover, no innovation of Ramus's that the rhetorician was to be a logician 'in the first stage of composition'. This was the merest commonplace of traditional rhetoric:

Therefore, I wishe that every manne should desire and seke to have his Logique perfect, before he looke to profite in Rhetorique, considering the grounde and confirmation of causes, is for the moste part gathered out of Logique.²

The Ramists did not put the *Demonstrative* and *Deliberative* types of oration 'into the discard', any more than they put the important *Judicial* type (which Miss Tuve has been obliged to ignore) 'into the discard'. They simply held that it was not the business of the logician or rhetorician to teach particular functions.

The particular functions of discussion of philosophical and ontological problems, 'figuring out', looking into, and mulling over, were not mentioned by the Ramists, let alone taught. The writer would have needed to go to traditional accounts of the *Judicial* oration for general instruction in such procedures. As for the claim that the Ramists sought to make these the methods of poetry, it is doubly untenable, for the reason stated, and because Ramists were quite unconcerned with the writing of verse, tamely acquiescing in traditionalist unwillingness to allow it any more than popular status. Miss Tuve has here overlaid and distorted the slight truth that Ramus tended to free logic and rhetoric from thralldom to the particular functions of polemics and persuasion.

The 'image' (presumably 'figure' is meant) was not rendered 'dialectically functional' by Ramism, if this phrase means 'having a function in proof, argument, or persuasion', and not just 'being logically classifiable as a meaning in a context'. The figure was actually less likely to be so in Ramist writers than in traditionalist, for readers of Ramus would have learned only incidentally and fragmentarily—or from other sources—of the use of figures

¹ 'R.F.', op. cit., p. 55.

² T. Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorique* (London, 1553), f. 63^v.

as devices of persuasion or argument. Correspondingly, it cannot be true that with Ramists 'Decorative images would not be a desideratum; they would indeed scarcely be a possibility', or that 'Images would be many, and oftener tropical than schematic'. Decoration for delight was the only function specifically assigned to figures in Ramist manuals, and in so far as the Ramist writer's occasions of stylistic delight were likely to be less frequent than the traditionalist's occasions of persuasion or proof, Ramism must have issued in a somewhat less frequent use of figures among its devotees, not more.

The conclusion is inescapable that altogether too much has been made of the attempt at reform in teaching method called Ramism, in itself and as an influence. But this does not mean that Donne criticism would do well to fall back on its old formulas, those empty catchwords Miss Tuve herself has so ably scouted, the 'emotional apprehension of thought', 'discordia concors', 'passionate thought and thoughtful passion', 'radical image', and the rest. It does mean that for the true explanation of 'Metaphysical' qualities and techniques one need seek no farther than the great sixteenth-century tradition of which Ramism was but a backwater—that of *wit* as it was developed in conventional rhetoric.

MILTON'S FIRST SONNET ON HIS BLINDNESS

By HARRY F. ROBINS

NO other sonnet by Milton is so widely known and so often quoted as the nineteenth, which begins 'When I consider how my light is spent'. Critic and casual reader have agreed that the poem records Milton's despondency over his loss of sight and his subsequent reconciliation to a sterile future in which he will merely await God's will. This interpretation has been ably stated by John S. Smart:

The . . . poem, composed when the calamity was fresh, and before he had become accustomed to a life in darkness, opens with a mood of discouragement and grief, and closes with quiet resignation. For the time Milton seems to have believed that his blindness must end his life as a poet, and that the great work which he had long meditated would never be written.¹

The assumption that the onset of total blindness occasioned the writing of the sonnet has been largely responsible for the common assignment of its composition to 1652.² A convincing case for the date 1655, however, has been presented by James Holly Hanford.³ In his recent edition of the poetry Professor Hanford reiterates his belief that this was the year in which Milton composed the nineteenth sonnet; he concludes, therefore, that the 'two blindness sonnets [XIX and XXII, to Cyriack Skinner, unquestionably the work of 1655] represent complementary attitudes: the one, religious resignation, the other, pride and firm resolve'.⁴ In this study I shall argue that the two sonnets articulate parallel rather than complementary attitudes, that, indeed, Sonnet XIX, while subtler, expresses more positively Milton's confidence in his ability to triumph over his affliction and to produce the great poetry toward which his ambitions had always been directed.

Acceptance of the view held by most commentators, that the poem was composed in 1652 and represents a temporary though profound despair, would be easier if the poet's affliction had been visited upon him without

¹ *The Sonnets of Milton* (Glasgow, 1921), p. 108.

² *The Poems of John Milton*, ed. James Holly Hanford (New York, 1953), p. 184. 'Because of the tone of this sonnet in contrast to Sonnet XXII, also because the expression "Ere half my days," fits better with an earlier date, recent editors have inclined to think it written soon after Milton's blindness became complete, i.e., in 1652.'

³ 'The Arrangement and Dates of Milton's Sonnets', *M.P.*, xviii (1920-1), p. 142.

⁴ *Ed. cit.*, p. 185.

warning. But, since his vision waned over a period of about eight years,¹ and since he deliberately chose blindness rather than dereliction in what he deemed his duty to his country, it is sensible to suppose that his adjustment was complete before his sight was entirely lost.² On the other hand, acceptance of the evidence for the date 1655 makes it necessary to consider the sonnet together with other expressions of Milton's attitude toward his blindness which belong to the same and to the preceding year. The *Second Defence* (1654) contains, of course, the fullest statement of the poet's reaction to his loss; and here it is clearly shown that his grief was qualified by the perception that a new strength might lie in his very weakness:

[My blindness] deprives things merely of their colour and surface; but takes not from the mind's contemplation whatever is real and permanent in them. . . . And, in truth, we who are blind, are not the last regarded by the providence of God; who, as we are the less able to discern any thing but himself, beholds us with the greater clemency and benignity. . . . The divine law, the divine favour, has made us not merely secure, but, as it were, sacred, from the injuries of men; nor would seem to have brought this darkness upon us so much by inducing a dimness of the eyes, as by the overshadowing of heavenly wings; and not infrequently is wont to illumine it again, when produced, by an inward and far surpassing light.³

The attitude permeating this whole passage, expressed before 1655, must have sustained the poet for the remainder of his life; it is echoed in *Paradise Lost*, iii. 51-55. It should not be doubted that the afflicted poet, when he felt himself God-illuminated, experienced a strengthened desire to write something which the world would not willingly let die. Certainly such an implication may be drawn from Milton's linking himself in the *Second Defence* with 'those old poets, ancientist and wisest, whose calamity the gods are said to have recompensed with far more excelling gifts' and with a number of blind champions of the past, all of whom achieved greatness in spite of their handicap.⁴ Such evidence of continued faith in his high destiny makes it difficult to believe that Milton ever contemplated the abandonment of what he deemed his clear obligation both to God and to mankind, the writing of a literary masterpiece which would do for Britain what Homer, Vergil, and Dante had done for their native lands. If the nineteenth sonnet reveals an abnegation of purpose, a suspension of will, then it surely records emotions transient and uncharacteristic.

¹ See the letter *To Leonard Philaras, Athenian*, 28 Sept. 1654, *The Works of John Milton* (Columbia edition, New York, 1931-8), xii. 67, 69: 'It is ten years, I think, more or less, since I felt my sight getting weak and dull.' Even in 1654, though he had been for all practical purposes blind for two years, the poet was capable of distinguishing night from day: '... when the eye rolls itself, there is admitted, as through a small chink, a certain little trifle of light.'

² See *Works*, viii. 68-71 and Masson's *Life*, iv. 429-32.

³ *Works*, viii. 71-73.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

Even more serious objections to the traditional explication arise when one understands the inferences which it forces the reader to draw from the last six lines. The nucleus of the octet is, most significantly, the parable of the talents. That the lesson of this parable held for Milton a personal message is apparent not only in the sonnet but also in that letter to an unknown friend which contained 'How soon hath Time the suttie thief of youth'. To the charge that he is dreaming away his 'yeares in the armes of studious retirement', Milton replies: 'but what delight or what peculiar conceit . . . could hold out against the long knowledge of a contrarie command from above, & the terrible seasure of him that hid his talent'.¹ The conventional interpretation of Sonnet XIX leads, then, to this impasse: Milton, remembering the terrible seizure of him who hid the talent, finds consolation in the assurance that he may serve God by regarding his blindness as a bar to future endeavour. To the poet's question, fondly asked, 'Doth God exact day-labour, light deny'd', the answer, we are to suppose, is 'Of course not'; because of his affliction the poet will henceforth be relieved of any obligation to develop his abilities; henceforth he will, in Smart's words, approve himself 'in the sight of God only by the humble and submissive acceptance of his decrees, and by waiting with quiet endurance for the fulfilment of his purposes'.² Further implications are unavoidable. God, whose state is kingly, desires nothing from man because he is sufficiently served by his angels (the 'Thousands') who ceaselessly do his bidding—though men also may render him service by simply enduring whatever burdens he imposes. In short, God demands of man only that he acquiesce in the vicissitudes of life, while remaining firm in faith. I submit that these sentiments not only directly contravene the import of the parable which Milton calls upon to emphasize his dread of failure but that to the poet they would have seemed ignoble.

Misunderstanding of the sonnet stems primarily from a misunderstanding of its concluding line. This line must be examined in its context:

Thousands at his bidding speed
And post o're Land and Ocean without rest:
They also serve who only stand and waite.

Commentators on these lines almost unanimously agree that they contain a comparison between angels (the 'Thousands') who actively engage in God's service and men on earth ('They') who, 'unable to do more, calmly submit to God's purposes', thus rendering him 'genuine service'.³ That the 'Thousands' are angels is obvious. I suggest, however, that 'They also', as

¹ *Works*, xii. 320, 321. Cf. III. i. 232.

² Smart, p. 110.

³ John Milton, *Lycidas, Sonnets, &c.*, ed. W. Bell (London, 1907), p. 171.

A. W. Verity alone among annotators has seen, are 'those other angels too—in contrast to the "thousands" just mentioned'.¹ The comparison is not between angels and men but between two kinds of angels; and only by implication and analogy may the sonnet be said to compare angels with men. The distinction is an important one, for, as I shall show, it leads directly to an interpretation of the poem which is diametrically opposed to the received opinion.

Christian writers who considered the nature and duties of the angels divided the heavenly host into two major categories, those who act as God's messengers, and those who remain eternally about his throne to do him honour. Thus the pseudo-Dionysius in his *De Hierarchia Celesti* says that the four superior orders of the celestial hierarchy are never sent as messengers since this duty belongs properly to the remaining five orders.² Dionysius's treatment is so diffuse as to make quotation from him unprofitable, but in the more ordered prose of St. Thomas Aquinas the concept is clearly set forth:

Proprietates autem angelorum ex eorum nominibus manifestantur, ut Dionysius dicit. . . . Et ideo angeli illorum ordinum ad exterius ministerium mittuntur, ex quorum nominibus aliqua executio datur intelligi. In nomine autem Dominationum non importatur aliqua executio, sed sola dispositio et imperium de exequendis. Sed in nominibus inferiorum ordinum intelligitur aliqua executio; nam Angeli et Archangeli denominantur a denuntiando; Virtutes et Potestates dicuntur per respectum ad aliquem actum; 'Principis etiam est', ut Gregorius dicit, 'inter alios operantes priorum existere'. Unde ad hos quandoque ordines pertinet in exterius ministerium mitti, non autem ad quatuor superiores.³

Of the distinction between the superior and inferior orders of angels Aquinas further says:

Dicendum quod angeli introducuntur assistentes et administrantes, ad similitudinem eorum qui alicui regi famulantur. Quorum aliqui semper ei assistunt, et eius praecepta immediate audiunt. Alii vero sunt, ad quos praecepta regalia per

¹ *Milton's Sonnets*, ed. A. W. Verity (Cambridge, 1933), p. 55.

² *The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite. Part II. The Heavenly Hierarchy, and The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, tr. John Parker (London, 1899), pp. 24-40.

³ Thomas De Aquino, *Summa Theologiae* (Ottawa, 1941), i. 669b-670a. The passage is translated in *Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Anton C. Pegis (New York, 1945), i. 1035-6, as follows: 'Now the angelic properties are manifested by their names, as Dionysius says, and therefore the angels of those orders are sent to external ministry whose names signify some kind of administration. But the name *Dominations* does not signify any such administration, but only disposition and command in administering. On the other hand, the names of the inferior orders imply administration, for the *Angels* and *Archangels* are so called from *announcing*, the *Virtues* and *Powers* are so called in respect of some act; and it is right that the *Prince*, according to what Gregory says, be *first among the workers*. Hence it belongs to these five orders to be sent to external ministry, but not to the four superior orders.'

assistentes nuntiantur, sicut illi qui administrationi civitatum praeficiuntur; et hi dicuntur ministrantes, sed non assistentes.

Sed non omnes angeli secreta divinorum mysteriorum in ipsa claritate divinae essentiae percipere possunt, sed soli superiores, per quos inferioribus denuntiantur. Et secundum hoc soli superiores, qui sunt primae hierarchiae, assistere dicuntur, cuius proprium dicit esse Dionysius immediate a Deo illuminari.¹

These gleanings from Aquinas, whose discussions of angels in the *Summa Theologiae* afford many equally enlightening passages, satisfactorily demonstrate, it seems to me, that 'They' in the concluding line of the sonnet are the four superior orders of the heavenly host.² These are raised higher than God's messengers and through Grace are immediately illumined by the Deity. It is their province to announce and interpret the divine mysteries and divine commands to the administrative or active orders. Like great noblemen in attendance upon a king, these angels 'waite' on the Lord.³ They 'stand' in his presence; compare 'I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God' (Luke i. 19).⁴

The meaning which I believe Milton hoped his readers would discover in the last three lines of the sonnet may now be stated: God is served by two kinds of angels, those of the inferior five orders who function as administrators in the world, doing his errands, bearing his messages; and those others of the four superior orders who 'only', that is, exclusively, do not leave his presence, wait or attend upon him to do him honour, and illumine those less

¹ Ibid., 669a. 'The angels are spoken of as *assisting* and *administering*, after the likeness of those who attend upon a king. Some of them always wait upon him, and hear his commands immediately; while there are others to whom the royal commands are conveyed by those who are in attendance—for instance, those who are placed at the head of the administration of various cities. These are said to administer, not to assist.

'Yet not all the angels can perceive the secrets of the divine mysteries in the splendor itself of the divine essence, but only the superior angels who announce them to the inferior. And in this respect only the superior angels belonging to the highest hierarchy are said to assist, whose special prerogative it is to be immediately illumined by God, as Dionysius says.' (Pegis, i. 1034-5).

² Professor Gwynne B. Evans has brought to my notice the reassuring fact that this conclusion has been anticipated by Sir Herbert Grierson, in his edition of *The Poems of John Donne* (Oxford, 1912), ii. 5, n. 1. He writes: 'The influence of Scholastic Philosophy and Theology in English poetry deserves attention. When Milton states that

They also serve who only stand and wait,

he has probably in mind the opinion of Dionysius the Areopagite (adopted by Aquinas), that the four highest orders of angels (Dominations, Thrones, Cherubs, and Seraphim) never leave God's presence to bear messages.' Professor Grierson's edition of Milton's poetry is not annotated.

³ So widely accepted is the traditional explication of the word 'waite', however, that *Webster's New International Dictionary* quotes the last line of the sonnet and italicizes the word as an example of the meaning 'to stay or rest in expectation; to stop or remain in readiness, &c.' But contrast *O.E.D.* under *Wait*, v.¹ 9.

⁴ It is probable that 'stand' carries also its Renaissance connotation of 'remain firm in faith'. Cf. *P.L.*, iii. 98-102; *P.R.*, iv. 541-61.

fortunate by transmitting and interpreting the divine will. This explicit comparison between angelic classes is, of course, simply the matrix for the implicit comparison through which Milton proclaims the special nature of his future role in the world of men. For if his blindness has removed him from those active pursuits by which God's purposes are furthered on earth, it has at the same time elevated him to a position among men corresponding to that enjoyed among angels by only the highest orders, those who 'stand and waite'. Thus, by means of the analogy, Milton enrolls himself with those who, like Moses, Augustine, Luther, and Calvin, have brought God to men and hence men to God.

That this interpretation is consistent with the remainder of the sonnet can be shown by looking again at what Milton says. The first six lines, of course, define the mood in which Milton asks the question central to the poem's meaning: 'Doth God exact day-labour, light deny'd?' What follows does not directly answer this question; rather it explains why the question is 'fondly' asked.

In the octet Milton describes the despondency he feels whenever he dwells upon the inexorable fact of his blindness and the prospect of an enforced end to the cultivation of his abilities; he sees himself compelled to invite the fate of the unprofitable servant in the parable, though his desire to make the most of what God has given him is increased (1-6). In this state of mind he is tempted to seek reassurance that nothing further will be expected of him, that God will *not* exact day-labour, light denied (7-8). He is tempted merely; the question remains a 'murmur', prevented or anticipated by the timely remembrance of the nature of the Deity and his relationship to his creatures:

God doth not need
 Either man's work or his own gifts, who best
 Bear his milde yোক, they serve him best, his State
 Is Kingly.

God is absolute; he needs nothing—from men or from angels. Those who would serve him not for his but for their own sakes 'best Bear his milde yोक'. To bear God's 'milde yोक' is, in a word, to obey: 'For my yोक is easy, and my burden is light', Christ tells his disciples (Matt. xi. 30). The marginal notation on this verse directs us to 1 John v. 3: 'For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous.' In *Paradise Lost* Raphael tells Adam:

My self and all th' Angelic Host that stand
 In sight of God enthron'd, our happie state
 Hold, as you yोक, while our obedience holds. (v. 535-7)

For Milton obedience had always lain in the production of a work worthy of his genius. At the age of twenty-four he had had 'long knowledge' of a

'command from above' that he avoid ease and retirement. As he knew that his extraordinary abilities were the 'inspired gulf of God rarely bestow'd',¹ so he knew also that in their best employment would lie the only satisfactory account which he could render to the giver—not for the aggrandizement of God, who needs no return from 'his own gifts', but for the poet's own salvation.

The last three lines of the sonnet constitute Milton's triumphant re-dedication of himself to the calling of poetry. Having until now laid aside his singing robes to execute God's will, he will assume them in the sure knowledge that the possession of a purer and more precious interior light makes him a fit interpreter of the divine mysteries. In the final analysis, then, the question central in the sonnet is *fondly* asked because the poet has *not* been denied light. Through that obscurity which envelops him God's own light clearly shines.

To contemplate a negation of action, an end to struggle, an idle ease, would not be worthy of one who believed himself a fellow servant with the angels.² Milton had no reason to wait until God made his will manifest. To obey God's definite command he had prepared himself by 'intent study . . . my portion in this life', for he knew that 'God even to a strictnesse requires the improvement of these his entrusted gifts'.³ True, for his country's sake he had reluctantly postponed the commencement of things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme while, like God's lesser angels, he busied himself in good works. True, finding 'wisdom at one entrance quite shut out', he feared at moments that he might prove inadequate to his appointed task. Yet even in such moments he sternly rebuked himself for seeking because of his blindness a special exemption from the responsibility which God had privileged him to bear. And in this chastened mood he discovered the strength that lay in his weakness, exultantly perceiving that like God's most favoured angels 'who only stand and waite', he also, illumined by a purer and more precious interior light than he had formerly enjoyed, might comprehend, interpret, and announce the ways of God. Such, I am convinced, is the experience which Milton records in his nineteenth sonnet. My conviction is fortified by the belief that this interpretation is consonant with the text of the poem, with attitudes revealed in Milton's other writings, with the date 1655 established by Mr. Hanford, and, above all, with the character of the poet, who consistently affirmed that his was a dedicated life.

¹ *Works*, iii (i), 238. The phrase is from *The Reason of Church Government Urged against Prelaty* (1641-2).

² See *P.L.*, viii. 224-8.

³ *Works*, iii (i), 236, 229. Both quotations are from *The Reason of Church Government Urged against Prelaty*.

JOHNSON'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LITERARY MAGAZINE

By D. J. GREENE

I

THE problem of establishing a satisfactory canon of Samuel Johnson's journalistic writings is a formidable one. Yet it can be ignored only at the risk of prejudice to future work: to base on a seriously deficient canon the thoroughgoing investigation of Johnson's thought and art in which modern students wish to engage is obviously hazardous. As one step in arriving at an acceptable canon, it is apparent that the contents of periodicals to which Johnson is known or thought to have contributed need to be scrutinized much more systematically than they have been in the past. Ideally, before such an examination is undertaken, there should be some attempt to define more precisely the not very clear or consistent principles of attribution on which much work of this kind has hitherto been based. But since this ideal remains an ideal, the student can only plunge in and hope that the experience gained in his floundering may contribute to the eventual development of an effective method.

This article is an attempt to determine more closely than has been done Johnson's part in the *Literary Magazine, or Universal Review* (London, 1756-8). Very little is known of the history of the ownership and direction of the *Literary Magazine*.¹ There are various accounts of the extent of Johnson's interest in it. Hawkins and Murphy say that his post was simply that of a reviewer. Boswell says that he 'engaged . . . to superintend and contribute largely' to it.² Boswell's phraseology may derive partly from the account of Johnson's writings that appeared in the *European Magazine* beginning in December 1784, which states: 'The intire superintendence of the performance, during 15 numbers, fell to the share of Dr. Johnson. . . .'³ Towards the end of this article, after an examination of the early numbers of the magazine, I shall offer some considerations that may contribute to a more precise definition of the extent of Johnson's control over its editorial policy.

¹ What is known about it is summarized by A. T. Hazen, *Johnson's Prefaces and Dedications* (New Haven, 1937), pp. 125-8.

² *Life of Johnson*, ed. Hill-Powell, i. 307.

³ Vol. vii (Feb. 1785), p. 83. The number 15 is no doubt due to the fact that Johnson's last known contribution (the final instalment of his review of Soame Jenyns's *Free Enquiry into the Origin of Evil*) appeared in Number 15 of the *Literary Magazine* (July 1757).

There exists in Boswell's *Life*¹ a list of thirty-two items in the *Literary Magazine* which Boswell says were written by Johnson. The authenticity and virtual completeness of this list seem to have been accepted almost without question, and it was reprinted entire in the Courtney-Nichol Smith bibliography of Johnson (Oxford, 1915). Its unchallenged currency for a century and a half would carry more weight if one were surer that most of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century students of Johnson who have silently acquiesced in it had even seen all the writings in question. For many of the pieces of the Boswell-Courtney list are highly difficult of access: of the thirty-two, eleven² have never, so far as I know, been reprinted, and are available only in the extremely scarce volumes of the *Literary Magazine* itself; and another seven³ were reprinted only in the almost equally scarce supplementary Volumes XIV and 'XV' of the 1787 edition of Johnson's *Works*. There is this much reason for assurance, however: none of the skilled Johnsonians who may be presumed to have examined all the pieces attributed in the list—among others, Malone, Alexander Chalmers, Croker, Hill, Powell, Hazen—has been seriously enough disturbed by any of them to raise a doubt that it is by Johnson.⁴ The completeness of the list, however, is another question, and one which seems never to have been properly investigated.

A sketch of the history of these attributions will indicate, I think, that we have no reason for assuming the Boswell-Courtney list to be based on authoritative testimony by someone in a position to know what Johnson's part in the magazine was, or on any systematic examination of the files of the magazine; rather, its development seems to have been a very haphazard business. The first public ascription to Johnson of writings that appeared in the *Literary Magazine* was apparently by Tom Davies in his *Miscellaneous and Fugitive Pieces* (London, 1773), 'which he advertised in the news-papers', Boswell tells us, "By the Authour of the Rambler".⁵

¹ i. 307-9; not the prefatory 'chronological catalogue', which contains only twenty-eight items. Although the two pamphlets *A Letter on the Case of Admiral Byng* and *An Appeal to the People Concerning Admiral Byng* form the subject of a single review, Boswell lists them as though they formed two separate reviews, and I follow his example.

² Items 14, 20, 38, 61, 62, 63, 74, 75, and 80 in the catalogue of the *Magazine* given below in this article; also the reviews of *The Cadet* and *Some Further Particulars in the Case of Admiral Byng* (L.M. 7).

³ Items 35, 72; the reviews of Charlotte Lennox's translation of Sully's *Memoirs*, *A Letter on the Case of Admiral Byng*, *An Appeal to the People Concerning Admiral Byng*, Lewis Evans's *Geographical . . . Essays . . . Containing an Analysis of a General Map of the Middle British Colonies in America* (all in L.M. 6), and of *The Conduct of the Ministry Impartially Examined* (L.M. 7).

⁴ 'The list of Johnson's articles [in the *Literary Magazine*] which Boswell compiled is probably substantially correct . . .' (Hazen, p. 126).

⁵ *Life*, ii. 271.

Davies reprinted a total of eight pieces from the magazine, six¹ of which are now accepted as Johnson's. The *European Magazine's* account (1784-5) says that Johnson 'wrote the Criticism on Books' during the first fifteen numbers; it also lists three non-review articles already attributed by Davies, and adds three more.² In Volume X of the 1787 *Works* of Johnson that accompanied the publication of Hawkins's *Life*, all six of Davies's authentic attributions are reprinted; to them are added the later (that in *L.M.* 13) of the two reviews of Hanway's *Eight Days Journey* and the 'Reply to a Paper in the *Gazetteer*' (*L.M.* 14).³ (The latter had already been listed in the *European Magazine*.) The editor of the supplementary Volume XIV (1788) of the *Works* reprinted an additional four pieces;⁴ and George Gleig, the editor of the supplementary 'Volume XV' (1789), reprinted still another six,⁵ saying in his preface that they, 'with the dedication of the Evangelical History Harmonized, are ascribed to him [Johnson] by a lady to whom he was long known, and whose name, were it mentioned, would remove every suspicion'. (Would this lady have been Charlotte Lennox, a review of one of whose books appears in the list?)

By 1791, then, a total of twenty pieces from the *Literary Magazine* (not counting the two rejected ones in Davies's *Miscellanies*) had been attributed to Johnson. Boswell, in the *Life*, gives two separate listings of Johnson's works, one, year by year, in the body of the *Life* itself, the other prefixed to it as a 'Chronological Catalogue'. In the list in the text, Boswell omitted

¹ Items 2, 17, 37, 69; the *Memoirs of Frederick III, King of Prussia* (*L.M.* 7, 8, 9), and the review of Soame Jenyns's *Free Enquiry* (*L.M.* 13, 14, 15). The two spurious attributions (if they can be called attributions) are the review of Burke's *Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful* (*L.M.* 13), which Boswell says Murphy claimed as his (no one since seems to have disputed Murphy's authorship), and *A Letter from a French Refugee in America* (item 22 below). It is clear that the letter is what it purports to be, and that Johnson wrote the *Observations* appended to it (item 23) (cf. my article 'The Johnsonian Canon: A Neglected Attribution', *P.M.L.A.*, lxx (1950), 427-34). Davies may have heard Johnson's name connected with the exchange, and muddle-headedly printed the non-Johnsonian letter instead of the Johnsonian *Observations*, just as he printed the non-Johnsonian *Thoughts on Agriculture* from the *Universal Visiter* and omitted to print Johnson's *Further Thoughts on Agriculture* which followed it.

² Items 1, 2, 45, 69; the *Memoirs of Frederick III* and the 'Reply to Jonas Hanway, esq.' (*L.M.* 14).

³ The 'short notice' of Hanway's book, in *L.M.* 7, seems to have been specifically attributed for the first time in the Courtney-Nichol Smith bibliography. It is symptomatic of the irresponsible 'editing' of nineteenth-century collections of Johnson's works that, although the review in *L.M.* 13 begins, 'Our readers may perhaps remember, that we gave them a short account of this book . . . in November, 1756', no one seems ever to have troubled to reprint the 'short account'.

In his *Life of Johnson* (1st edn., p. 351) Hawkins omits *The Political State of Great Britain* and the review of Newton; otherwise his list of Johnson's contributions to the *Literary Magazine* is that of Vol. X.

⁴ Item 23; the reviews of the *Letter* and *Appeal* concerning Byng (*L.M.* 6), and of *The Conduct of the Ministry* (*L.M.* 7). It also reprinted, for the first time, items 1 and 45, previously listed in the *European Magazine*.

⁵ Items 15, 35, 72, the reviews of Charlotte Lennox's *Sully*, Evans's *Middle Colonies*, and Elizabeth Harrison's *Miscellanies* (*L.M.* 6).

one of the twenty pieces from the magazine previously attributed, and added thirteen more.¹ Since Boswell, one other attribution to Johnson of a piece in the *Literary Magazine* has been made—that by Birkbeck Hill of the 'review of *A True Account of Lisbon Since the Earthquake*' (*L.M.* 1). Powell properly finds this attribution 'very doubtful'.²

The total of thirty-two pieces in Boswell's list (that is, the longer of his two discrepant lists) is, then, a composite of the work of at least six people, each adding something to what earlier editors had left, but sometimes also omitting, presumably through simple negligence, something previously attributed. None of them seems to have worked on any system, but all would appear to have made their discoveries through vague hearsay or by a casual thumbing through of the magazine. Modern students have no great reason to pride themselves on having improved on their predecessors. Courtney does little more than repeat Boswell's list, and manages to make his own small contribution of error by crediting Boswell with Hill's erroneous attribution of the 'review of the *Account of Lisbon*'.³ Neither Courtney nor the Hill-Powell edition of Boswell's *Life* takes any notice of the attempts by Chalmers, Malone, and Croker to correct the canon.

In sum, what Allen Hazen has concluded about Boswell's attributions of Johnson's prefaces and dedications may properly be read also in connexion with the Boswell-Courtney list of Johnson's contributions to the *Literary Magazine*:

I am inclined to believe that Boswell never made any real search for scattered items, but relied on his conversations with Johnson . . . and on previous publications: the reader will notice how many of these writings had been included in Vol. xiv of the *Works* and Davies's *Miscellaneous and Fugitive Pieces*.⁴

¹ Boswell's omission of the *Observations on A Letter from a French Refugee in America* (*L.M.* 2) is probably of no significance, and can readily be ascribed to oversight: between his compilation of the list in the text of the *Life* and of that in the prefatory 'Chronological Catalogue', Boswell managed to mislay no fewer than four of his own attributions—items 14, 17, 35, and the review of Jenyns's *Free Enquiry*. Alexander Chalmers picked up the *Observations* again, and they were restored to the canon in a note to Malone's edition of Boswell's *Life*, which was acquiesced in by Croker (*Life*, ed. Malone (London, 1823), I. xxxi; ed. Croker (London, 1831), v. 488).

To six pieces from the *Literary Magazine*, Boswell in his 'Chronological Catalogue' appends the note 'acknowl.'. These are the review of Charlotte Lennox's *Sully*, the three pieces on Admiral Byng, and the two Hanway pieces. Boswell explains his notation thus: 'To those which he himself [Johnson] acknowledged is added *acknowl.*' In the list in the text, the notation 'acknowl.' is replaced by an asterisk, the explanation of which varies significantly: 'Some of them I know he avowed, and have marked them with an *asterisk* accordingly.' The first note allows us to think that the acknowledgement was made directly to Boswell; the second makes it clear that it was second-hand. Since Boswell never tells us his intermediate source (as Gleig does), and since in any case Boswell sometimes marks with an obelus ('*intern. evid.*') in the text a piece which in the 'Catalogue' he marks 'acknowl.' (e.g. the *Life of Ascham*), the student cannot take the distinction very seriously.

² And see note on item 98 below.

⁴ Hazen, p. xviii, n. 12.

³ Noted by Powell, *Life*, i. 544.

(And Boswell seems not even to have had any conversations with Johnson about the *Literary Magazine*.) There is evidently nothing sacred about the origin of the *Davies-European Magazine*-Hawkins-Volume XIV-Gleig-Boswell-Courtney canon to deter the student from recommencing a search of the *Literary Magazine* for items to add to it.

The force of prescription in matters of canon being what it is, it probably needs to be affirmed that such addition is not to be regarded as a rash and unadvised action. If we had reason to believe that Boswell had sources of information unavailable to us about Johnson's part in the *Literary Magazine*, we might be deterred from tampering with his list; but if he had such sources, he would surely have mentioned them. Or if we had reason to believe Boswell necessarily a better judge of 'internal evidence' of Johnson's writing than modern students of Johnson, we might be deterred; but again we have no such reason. On the contrary, when the Boswell-Courtney list came into being in so unsystematic a manner, it would seem wrong for the student concerned with establishing a sound canon to remain satisfied with it. When it is known that Johnson 'contributed largely' to a periodical, the student's method must be to go through the file of that periodical item by item, examining the style and content of each piece; and it seems reasonable that he should work on the premises that if he encounters a piece of writing compatible with Johnson's known styles and interests in the middle of a number that contains many pieces already attributed to Johnson on 'internal evidence' only (and their attribution not controverted), there is a legitimate presumption that it too is by Johnson, unless there exist reasons to believe otherwise. I propose to examine the first five numbers of the *Literary Magazine* by this procedure. It is a somewhat tedious method, but it should in the long run save time: the desultory methods pursued over the past two centuries have, I believe, resulted in discovering only part of Johnson's contributions to the magazine, and the same desultory methods, if continued, might require another two centuries to turn up the remainder.

There can be only one objection of force to such a procedure. This must come from the student who believes that the Boswell-Courtney list is too long rather than too short. Certainly, if the sceptical critic were asked whether the following passages were Johnson's, they would very probably be rejected:

St. Mary's, the largest and most cultivated island, is three miles long and two wide. It contains about six hundred inhabitants, who pay three hundred pounds a year for rent. Old-Town was formerly the chief place in this island, but is now deserted and decayed, yet the church and parsonage house are still there, though the inhabitants are removed to Heugh-Town, about a mile distant; where there is a fortification, and a house for the governor called Star-castle, from its

radicated form. Here is a new pier, under the shelter of which ships of 150 tons may lie in security.

After the cloth has been sorted into parcels of an equal fineness, as near as can be judged, they are latched, linked, and then steeped. Steeping is the first operation. The linens are folded up, each piece distinct, and laid in a wooden vessel; into which is thrown, blood-warm, a sufficient quantity of water, or equal parts of water and lye, or water with rye-meal or bran mixed with it, till the whole is thoroughly wet, and the liquor rises over all. Then a cover of wood is laid over the cloth, and that cover is secured to prevent the cloth from rising during the fermentation which ensues.

The principal beast of burden is the camel, of which the species are four, the Turkman camel, the Arab, the dromedary, and the camel with two bunches. The Turkman camel is the largest; his common load is 800 pounds, but he cannot bear heat, and therefore lies still in the summer months. The Arab being smaller carries about 500 pounds. He can endure heat, and scarcely needs any sustenance but the thistles which he crops as he goes along loaded. They have been known to travel fifteen days without water, but then drank so eagerly that many died.¹

But they occur in reviews attributed to Johnson by Gleig and Boswell, and hitherto unquestioned. Here again is the whole (apart from quotation) of the review of Browne's *Christian Morals*:²

This little volume consists of short essays written with great vigour of sentiments, variety of learning and vehemence of style. Many allusions, which to common readers must appear obscure, are explained in short notes.

The narration prefixed contains rather observations on the author's character, than incidents of his life, which, like that of other learned men, appears to have passed without any extraordinary adventures or revolutions of fortune. It is closed with the following remarks on his writings and opinions. . . .

There is nothing very distinctively 'Johnsonian' about this; and it might even be argued that since it is in effect a review of Johnson's own work (the *Life of Browne* prefixed to the book), considerations of literary decorum might prevent us from ascribing it to Johnson. Yet it probably occurred to Boswell that no one else on the staff of the *Magazine* at the time was more likely than Johnson to have written it; and there is cogency in the argument.

I am inclined to take a liberal position, generally, regarding Johnson's part in the early numbers, at least, of the magazine: I am willing, along with other students from Malone to Hazen, to accept the Boswell-Courtney attributions; and having done so, I find myself compelled to accept other pieces, which there is no less evidence for believing Johnson's, as entitled to a place of equal authenticity in the canon. The sceptic may, if he wishes, reject

¹ From items 38, 61, 35 respectively.

² Item 62.

these additional attributions, but if he does so, the onus is surely his to show why he should continue to accept the Boswell-Courtney list. If this article stimulates other students to go into the whole question of the basic criteria to be used in establishing a canon of Johnson's journalistic writings, we shall be the closer to attaining the great desideratum of all Johnsonians, a satisfactorily comprehensive edition of Johnson's prose works.

II

I shall now list the contents of each of the five numbers of the *Literary Magazine*, numbering the items consecutively throughout, and prefixing 'J' to each item that has previously been attributed to Johnson (with the source of the earliest attribution that I know of), 'NJ' to items that seem to me, for reasons which I state below, evidently not Johnson's, and a question-mark to items which fall into neither group.

Literary Magazine, Vol. I, No. 1 (15 April to 15 May 1756):

- | | | | |
|----|-----|--------------|--|
| J | 1. | pp. [iii]-iv | To the Public (<i>European Magazine</i>) |
| J | 2. | 1-9 | An Introduction to the Political State of Great Britain (Davies) |
| NJ | 3. | 9-10 | A Letter from an Officer at Minorca to His Friend at London |
| ? | 4. | 11-14 | The History of Minorca, extracted from the history written in the form of letters by Mr. Armstrong in 1740 |
| NJ | 5. | 14-16 | On the Inconveniences and Disorders Arising from Strait Lacing in Stays |
| NJ | 6. | 16-17 | Premiums for the Incouragement of Arts, Manufactures, &c. |
| NJ | 7. | 17-20 | The Temple of Usury |
| NJ | 8. | 20-22 | An Authentic Account of the Present State of Lisbon . . .
Extracted from a pamphlet intitled A Satirical Review of the Manifold Falsehoods and Absurdities hitherto published concerning the Earthquake. Printed for C. Corbett |
| ? | 9. | 22-26 | A Description of the Anatomy of a Manatee, or Sea-Cow, found near an island to the East of Kamtschatka |
| NJ | 10. | 26-27 | A Letter from Mr. Woulfe on Flowers made by Crystallization |
| ? | 11. | 27-28 | Review of <i>Collateral Bee-Boxes; or a new, easy, and advantageous method of managing bees</i> , by Stephen White, M.A. |
| NJ | 12. | 28-29 | Two pages of music and poetry |
| J | 13. | 30-32 | Review of Birch's <i>History of the Royal Society</i> (Boswell) |
| J | 14. | 32-35 | Review of Murphy's <i>Gray's Inn Journal</i> (Boswell) |
| J | 15. | 35-38 | Review of Warton's <i>Essay on Pope</i> (Gleig) |
| J | 16. | 39-41 | Review of Hampton's <i>Polybius</i> (Boswell) |

- J 17. 41-42 Review of Blackwell's *Court of Augustus* (Davies)
 ? 18. 43-48 Historical Memoirs from January 1, 1756
 NJ 19. 49-54 Chronological Diary from the 1st of January, 1756. List of Deaths, Promotions, &c. Price of Stocks from April 15 to May 14.

There seems no point in discussing here whether or not Johnson had a hand in compiling items 12 and 19, routine sections of every magazine. Of the other 'non-Johnsonian' items, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 10 are signed or otherwise indicated as not coming from the permanent 'staff writers' of the *Magazine*. There seems no reason to doubt that 3 is what it purports to be, a letter from an officer stationed in Minorca; 5 is a medical essay, signed 'R.B.'; ¹ 6 is a notice from the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, signed by its secretary, William Shipley; 7 is a reprint of *The Connoisseur*, No. 117; the author of 10, Peter Woulfe, later F.R.S., contributed pieces to later numbers of the *Magazine*.

Item 8 is the controversial piece attributed by Hill. It will be seen that Hill, Powell, and Courtney all describe this piece inaccurately, Hill and Powell misquoting its title as well. As the title indicates, it is not a review of nor an extract from a book entitled *An Authentic Account of the Present State of Lisbon*, but an account of Lisbon extracted from a pamphlet entitled *A Satirical Review*, &c. I suspect that the paragraphs of comment which follow the 'account' were not supplied by the *Literary Magazine* at all, but that the *whole* item is a quotation from *A Satirical Review*, which in turn is quoting the 'account' from another source and then satirically commenting on it. I have not, however, been able to find a copy of the pamphlet to verify my guess. At any rate, the style is highly unlike anything known to have been written by Johnson.

There remain four unsigned items. These will be considered in detail, remembering that, apart from routine matter such as the music and poetry section and the 'chronological diary', all the remaining 'uncontributed' content of the number has already been attributed to Johnson. The question that must be asked is, does the style of any or all of these four items differ sufficiently from known specimens of Johnson's writing to warrant our postulating the existence of another 'staff writer' of the *Magazine* as their author?

Item 4, *The History of Minorca*, deserves careful attention. Much of the content of the *Literary Magazine* consists of 'extracts' and 'abstracts' from other writings. Sometimes these are direct quotations, usually but not

¹ Perhaps Richard Bathurst, who a few years before had collaborated with Johnson in *The Adventurer*. 'I have viewed the children of naked people in Africa and America, and never saw one deformed in their bodies', says the writer of the article. Bathurst was familiar with Negro slaves in the West Indies, and had sent Francis Barber to Johnson.

always indicated by inverted commas; sometimes they are 'condensations', freely rewritten. This article, deriving from John Armstrong's *History of the Island of Minorca* (London, 1752), belongs to the latter class. The style of such abridgements is normally a straightforward, business-like one, without much rhetorical ornament or involution of sentence structure. It has perhaps not been sufficiently emphasized that Johnson, as a professional journalist, was extremely competent in using just such a style, where his material called for it. Examples are the translation of Le Grand's *Relation d'un voyage historique d'Abissinie* ('Lobo's Abyssinia'), where Johnson frequently condenses the original; much of his biographical writing, in particular the early lives of Blake, Drake, Barretier, and others; and a great deal of the *Journey to the Western Islands*. It is distinguished from the ordinary workaday journalism of the time only by its consistent precision, clarity, and vigour. Much of the *History of Minorca* in the *Literary Magazine* consists of straightforward 'reportage', narrative and descriptive, like the following passages:

The Moors obtained succours from Barbary, and omitted no preparations for a vigorous defence; but, being defeated with great slaughter in two battles, they retired to Mount Agatha, a naked rock of great height, well fortified and stored, and accessible only by a narrow passage. Hither they were pursued; but the assailants, however resolute and eager, were always repulsed. Famine at last supplied the inefficacy of the sword; Agatha was surrendered, and in 1287, the Moors of Minorca became slaves to the Spaniards on the 17th of January, which is still observed there as a high festival. . . .

The carnival or festival before Lent is their time of pleasure; no trade is exercised during this happy season, but all the day and night is filled up with ceremonies of religion, or spectacles of entertainment.

When they dance, which is their usual diversion, as indeed of all nations civil and barbarous, the man endeavours to move with great agility and strength, and the lady, with much solemnity and slowness, her eyes being always fixed upon the ground.

There is little here of the traditional 'Johnsonese' of the *Rambler*; yet if the style of these extracts is compared with, say, that of much of the *Journey to the Western Islands* (or with the review of Russell's *Aleppo*, which is along almost identical lines), it will be seen that it is by no means incompatible with an attribution to Johnson.

But the article contains also a good deal of editorial comment, not deriving from the book by Armstrong, which in both style and content seems to mark the piece as unmistakably Johnson's. For instance, at the time when the British captured the island in 1708,

The inhabitants capitulated for the continuance of their old laws and customs, though inconvenient and oppressive; and indeed it was natural for a people little

acquainted with the state of other countries, and conquered by men whom they considered as heretics, and had been taught to dread and hate, as the most mischievous of the human race, to prefer any condition, of which they knew all the good and bad, before that which the caprice of a conqueror might prescribe. . . .

The sentiments expressed are in direct contradiction to those of Armstrong in the original, who thinks that 'the Minorquins fatally missed a favourable opportunity of becoming partakers of all the various benefits of the mildest constitution of government upon earth' (p. 98). Johnson's tenderness toward conquered and invaded peoples is one of the most consistent of his political attitudes.

The article concludes with some paragraphs on the possible consequences of the projected assault on Minorca by the French; these are, I think, unquestionably Johnsonian, in both style and content:

There is reason to believe, that St. Philip is now besieged by a powerful enemy, well provided, and, I think, it is made too plain in the quotation [from Armstrong, above] that resistance cannot be long. Whether our fleet will arrive soon enough to save it, or whether we are not in danger of having the fleet overpowered it is not possible to determine, nor prudent to predict. If we should destroy the fleet and reinforce the garrison, the besiegers will then be themselves besieged, for we can supply the fort at pleasure, and an army before it must moulder away by desertion and diseases. If they should have taken the fort before the arrival of our fleet, yet, if even then their fleet should be destroyed, they will pay dearly for their purchase, for it will not be easy to furnish them with provisions, while we are masters of the sea.

There is, I fear, one great advantage on their side. The natives will probably favour them, as they have no *Anstruther* among them, and are of their own religion. The time is now come, when it will appear that oppression is folly as well as wickedness, and that whoever expects fidelity from a conquered people, must send men like *Kane* to govern them. A people taxed, harassed, and insulted, will always be desirous of changing their condition, and the new comer will always be welcome, since they cannot fear him more, and they will hate him less.

The identical view, that 'oppression is folly as well as wickedness', is emphatically expressed by Johnson a few pages before in the article on *The Political State of Great Britain*, in connexion with the treatment of the American Indians by the European settlers.

It is always good to consider the worst that can happen, and therefore I have amused myself with considering what we shall really lose by losing Minorca. . . . [Calculations follow of the expense of maintaining a garrison.]

Of the advantages arising from this place, I can collect no such accurate account, but confess, that I am not able to image to myself any that in forty-eight years have been equivalent to so much money, and so many lives. It is said to

increase our reputation in the Levant, but that reputation neither makes us much richer nor much happier.

If the distribution of empire were in my hands, I should indeed rather give up Gibraltar, the possession of which will always keep us at variance with Spain, than Minorca which may be less invidiously retained. But I know not whether either is worth its charge, and by losing them, I am not sure that we shall suffer any thing more than that vexation which accompanies disgrace, and the pain of doing that against our will, which we should have been glad to do if no violence had compelled us.

These anti-expansionist, 'little Englander' opinions are of a piece with those expressed in other political articles in the *Magazine* already attributed to Johnson, and I have no hesitation in ascribing this to him.

Item 9, *A Description of the Anatomy of a Manatee* . . ., is a piece of bald, straightforward reporting, presumably 'abstracted' from some source which I have not identified. Here is a sample:

The Manatee has no voice nor cry, nor makes any noise but what proceeds from fetching of his breath. What use he makes of his eyes or ears is very hard to say, but he does not seem to make much use of either, from any trials that could be made. But the account Dampier gives, seems to infer the contrary; for, he says, the hunters always follow this animal with as little noise as possible.

Johnson did not mind turning his pen to such employment: there are descriptions, written in a very similar style, of the hyena and the broad-tailed sheep and various species of camel in the review of Russell's *Aleppo* (see above), and of various African animals in *A Voyage to Abyssinia*. Johnson seems generally to have made use of 'he' instead of the modern 'it' in descriptions of animals.

Item 11 is the review of the delightfully-entitled *Collateral Bee-Boxes*, by Stephen White, M.A. As every other review in this number of the magazine has already been attributed to Johnson, I see no reason for denying him this. It is tempting to assert that the opening paragraph is Johnsonian humour at its driest:

The reverend author of this little treatise appears to be a man of ingenuity, candor, and, what is far more valuable, of piety; willing to communicate his knowledge for the advantage of others, and careful to learn before he presumes to teach, having, as he declares, tried every method before he found the right, and *been almost forty years in making a bee-box* [italics in original].

As far as the remainder of the review (an 'abstract' of White's methods of bee-keeping) is concerned, there seems to be no less and no more reason for attributing it to Johnson than the reviews of Lucas on Waters and of

Hales on Distilling Sea-Water, Ventilators in Ships, and Curing an Ill-Taste in Milk:

It has been found by experience, that bees swarming late, and wanting provisions of their own, cannot be preserved by honey given them, however liberally, either because such honey corrupts, or because the crude wax, called bee-bread, is necessary to their support. When two colonies therefore are weak, there is no way but that of suffering them to perish or supplying one by the destruction of the other. . . .

Item 18, *Historical Memoirs from January 1, 1756*, consists entirely of the text of official documents, except for linking and introductory sentences, which might well be Johnson's:

The authentic papers that follow are to be considered as *materials for the history of the present times*, which is one part of our plan to preserve. To these the inquisitive reader will find frequent occasion hereafter to refer; though perhaps they may convey no new information at this particular juncture.

III

Literary Magazine, Vol. I, No. 2 (15 May to 15 June 1756):

- | | | |
|-----------|---------|--|
| J 20. pp. | [57]-63 | Extract of the [Militia Bill] . . . with Remarks (Boswell) |
| NJ 21. | 63-64 | An Estimate for a Militia |
| NJ 22. | 64-66 | A Letter from a French Refugee in America to His Friend a Gentleman in England |
| J 23. | 66-67 | Observations on the Foregoing Letter (Volume XIV) |
| NJ 24. | 67-69 | The History of an Orphan |
| NJ 25. | 69-72 | Rustic Elegance |
| NJ 26. | 72 | The Effect of Musk in Curing the Gout in the Stomach |
| NJ 27. | 72-74 | His Majesty's Declaration of War against the French King |
| ? 28. | 74-76 | A Description of a Sea-Bear, found near an island to the East of Kamschatka |
| NJ 29. | 76-77 | Of the Appearance of the Planet VENUS in the day-time this present year, 1756 |
| NJ 30. | 77 | The Process of making AEther |
| ? 31. | 77-78 | 'On Ancient Characters' (running-head)—A Letter from J. Ames to John Booth, of Bernard's Inn, Esq. |
| NJ 32. | 78 | Problems in Chemistry by Mr. Woulfe |
| NJ 33. | 78-79 | On Routs |
| NJ 34. | 79 | Calculation of Insurances [on ships] |
| J 35. | 80-86 | Review of Russell's <i>Natural History of Aleppo</i> (Gleig) |
| ? 36. | 86-88 | Review of Robert Whytt's <i>Physiological Essays</i> |
| J 37. | 89-91 | Review of Newton's <i>Letters to Bentley</i> (Davies) |
| J 38. | 91-97 | Review of Borlase's <i>History of the Isles of Scilly</i> (Boswell) |
| NJ 39. | 97-100 | List of books and pamphlets published since January 1 |

- NJ 40. 100-1 An Alphabetical List of the Sovereign Princes in Europe
 NJ 41. 102-4 Poetry
 ? 42. 105-6 Historical Memoirs. Of the Rise of the Troubles in America
 NJ 43. 107-[12] Chronological Diary, List of Deaths, &c.

Of the 'non-Johnsonian' items, 21, 27, and 34 are documentary or statistical; 25 and 33 are reprinted papers from *The World*; 25, 26, 29, and 32 are signed ('Anglo-Gallus'; James Pringle; 'Astrophilus'; Peter Woulfe). Item 30, on making ether, though not signed, is in the form of a letter to the *Magazine*, and none of Johnson's known contributions to the *Magazine* are in the form of correspondence.¹ Item 24, a pathetic account of a neglected boy from 'O-----n [Otherton?], Staffordshire', who came to London and got into trouble there, is written in a style certainly not Johnson's, though the introductory and closing sentences might be; and Johnson, as a Staffordshire man and a humanitarian, may well have been responsible, in his editorial capacity, for publishing this contribution.

Item 28 is evidently from the same source and by the same hand as item 9; it could conceivably be by Johnson. The bulk of item 31 is undoubtedly what it purports to be, a letter from Joseph Ames, F.S.A., F.R.S., on the subject of some strange-looking characters found inscribed on a stone. But the paragraph of sceptical comment appended to it could well be Johnson's:

The curious author of the foregoing paper seems a little misled by a desire too frequent among inquirers into past time, a desire to exalt every thing into remote antiquity. Whatever was meant by the numbers on this stone, they certainly do not intend the year in which it was thus engraved. The shape of the figures is modern, very modern. The numeral character of *four* was as lately as the fifteenth century of another form, as this exact inspector of the dates of old books very well knows. It was represented thus [] as the half of 8 eight.

Johnson might well characterize himself as 'this exact inspector of the dates of old books', not only as a sometime apprentice bookseller but also as one of the compilers of the Harleian Catalogue.

Item 36 is the only review in the first seven numbers of the *Literary Magazine* that I cannot satisfy myself to be Johnson's. Stylistically I find

¹ To be sure, when Murphy first met Johnson, a short time before this appeared, he found him 'all covered with soot like a chimney-sweeper, in a little room, with an intolerable heat and strange smell, as if he had been acting Lungs in the Alchymist, making aether' (Mrs. Piozzi, *Anecdotes*, in *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, ed. Hill, i. 306). Hill is puzzled because Lungs in *The Alchemist* was making not ether but 'elixir'. The answer is surely that the phrase 'making aether', in Mrs. Piozzi's loosely constructed sentence, qualifies not 'Lungs', but 'Johnson'. The method described in the *L.M.* article, and no doubt the one used by Johnson, is the ordinary laboratory method of distilling a mixture of sulphuric acid and ethyl alcohol, which does indeed produce 'an intolerable heat and strange smell'.

it indeterminate, and the point of view seems rather that of a practising physician than of an amateur of medicine like Johnson. It might be by the author of item 5 (Bathurst?).

Item 42, *Historical Memoirs*, is difficult. In the first number of the *Magazine* this section was made up of the texts of official documents, diplomatic exchanges, and the like, with a sentence or two of editorial explanation introducing each. Now, for several numbers, it consists of a connected narrative, recounting and commenting on recent events in America, in Europe, and at home. I should hesitate to ascribe all or even much of this narrative to Johnson on the basis of its style, which, although competent, is not distinctively Johnsonian (and yet I should not be too surprised if it were proved to be Johnson's). There are, however, occasional passages which are, I think, almost certainly Johnson's: for instance this, the first paragraph of the narrative proper in the present instalment (following an introductory paragraph that does not strike me as Johnson's):

That some of our settlements on that vast continent are held by purchase, and others by voluntary concession, is, we believe, universally known; neither will it be disputed that this kind of tenure is preferable to force; yet while we boast the justice of our title let us not forget that our possessions have limits; let us not, because we owe much to the generosity of our Indian friends, be so unreasonably covetous as not to be contented with less than all that they had to give.

Or, as Johnson more forcibly put it, in *The Political State of Great Britain* the previous month, 'They who intrude, uncalled, upon the country of a distant people, ought to consider the natives as worthy of common kindness, and content themselves to rob without insulting them'.

IV

Literary Magazine, Vol. I, No. 3 (15 June to 15 July 1756):

- | | | |
|--------|---------------------------------------|--|
| NJ 44. | pp. [113]-19 | Texts of the Anglo-Russian and Anglo-Hessian treaties |
| J 45. | 119-21 | Observations on the Foregoing Treaties (<i>European Magazine</i>) |
| NJ 46. | 121-3 | An Account of the Effects of Lightning at Plymouth |
| NJ 47. | 123 | An Account of the Eruption of Mount /Etna |
| NJ 48. | 123-4 | A Letter from a Merchant who was long in the Lisbon and Levant Trades, before he declined Business |
| NJ 49. | 124-5 | Electrical Experiments . . . by Mr. Benjamin Franklin |
| NJ 50. | 126-7 | Extraordinary Fondness in a Wife |
| NJ 51. | 127-8 | Extract of a Letter concerning Electricity from Mr. B. Franklin |
| NJ 52. | 128-121 (<i>bis</i>) | (pagination duplicated) Extract of a Letter of Thomas Barker |
| NJ 53. | 121 (<i>bis</i>)-122 (<i>bis</i>) | The French King's Declaration of War on Britain |

- NJ 54. 123 (bis) Account of a Fish discovered in a Stone
 NJ 55. 123 (bis) A Letter to F—y M—y
 NJ 56. 124 (bis)—126 (bis) Extract of an account of those malignant Fevers
 that raged at Rouen
 ? 57. 126 (bis)—133 Abstract of the Charge and Defence of Mr. A. Bower
 NJ 58. 134-5 An extraordinary Sheep in Devonshire
 NJ 59. 135 The Method of curing the Cancer of the Eye-lids
 NJ 60. 135 Account of a very remarkable Case of a Boy . . .
 J 61. 136-41 Review of Francis Home, *Experiments on Bleaching* (Boswell)
 J 62. 141-3 Review of Sir Thomas Browne, *Christian Morals* (Boswell)
 J 63. 143-5 Review of Stephen Hales, *An Account of a Useful Dis-*
covery . . . [on distillation, ventilation, &c.] (Boswell)
 NJ 64. 146 A Process for separating the Gold and Silver from Lace
 without burning it
 ? 65. 147-50 An Account of the Islands of Alderney, Guernsey, Jersey,
 and Sark
 NJ 66. 150-2 Poetry
 ? 67. 153-6 Historical Memoirs
 NJ 68. 156-60 Chronological Diary, &c.

Items 44 and 53 are public documents; 50 is a reprint from *The Connoisseur*; 48, controverting the argument in item 4 above that Gibraltar should be surrendered before Minorca, is presumably an authentic letter; 64 is signed by Peter Woulfe; 55, a squib about the notorious Fanny Murray, 'a famous courtesan in town', is signed 'T. B.'; 46, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, 56, 58, 59, and 60 are all reprinted (sometimes with slight abridgements) from Vol. XLIX, Part 1, of *Philosophical Transactions*, which Johnson reviewed in the next number of the *Magazine* (item 80).

Item 57 is interesting. John Douglas, later Bishop of Salisbury—'the great detector of impostures' as Boswell calls him—is known to have been associated with Johnson in the exposure of two celebrated frauds of the eighteenth century, Lauder's attempt to prove Milton guilty of plagiarism, in 1750, and the Cock-Lane ghost, in 1762. Both cases gave rise to publications written by Johnson to acquaint the public with the facts of the frauds.

There was a third such case, at least equally notorious, in which Douglas won celebrity as a detective—that of Archibald Bower, ex-Jesuit and author, or plagiarist, of a *History of the Popes*. The complicated and fascinating story can be conveniently read in *D.N.B.* under Bower's name. It is pleasant to be able to suggest here that Johnson took a hand in this case too. Indeed, with Douglas hot on the trail of a literary fraud, and with Johnson in charge of a periodical publication at the time when the whole affair came to a head, in 1756, it would be surprising not to find Johnson writing about it.

It seems to me, from both the style and the manner of treatment of the

case in this article, that the body of it is Johnson's (there may be some doubt about the weaker introductory and closing paragraphs). An excerpt follows:

In the year 1747, Mr. Bower published proposals for a History of the Popes, in the title of which he gives himself many titles to which his claim has been publicly questioned, and not yet proved; among others that of counsellor, which, in the stile of foreign courts, implies judge [.] of the inquisition at Macerata, is apparently false, no jesuit being ever an inquisitor.

To give his history credit, he declares, that he was employed in the Vatican to write in defence of the Pope's supremacy, but that the further he advanced in the work, the more he was convinced that the supremacy of the Pope was not to be defended, and that he then abjured in his heart the religion of Rome.

It is asserted that after this mental abjuration, he was still so well contented with popery that he took his last vows among the Jesuits, and in the account which multitudes are said to have heard from him, he has been accustomed to ascribe his conversion to the sight of the cruelties practised by the inquisition at Macerata.

Little doubt, however, was made by the public of the reality of our historian's conversion, till in 1750, Mr. Barron a dissenting teacher published the following narrative, as taken from Mr. Bower's own mouth. [A quotation from Barron follows; also the famous six letters Bower was supposed to have written to Father Sheldon, Provincial of the English Jesuits, which were produced by Sir Henry Bedingfield and published by Douglas. Bower claimed they were forgeries; Douglas maintained their authenticity.]

If these letters are genuine, there is no doubt, but that this man who on the 25th of March, 1747, commenced so zealous a champion for the reformation, was on the 14th of March, 1747, a very zealous papist, and a jesuit unreservedly submissive to his superiors.

These letters have been compared with other pieces written by him, and the handwriting appears the same. Mr. Bower, however, has denied them upon oath. This is said to prove nothing, and indeed cannot prove much when the question concerning which the oath is taken, is only whether the deponent is a man to be credited.

Whether from the facts mentioned in them they can be proved to be counterfeited is then to be examined. Mr. Bower fixes this part of his defence upon the mention of the woman and the child, and has indeed urged this objection with great force. [A quotation from Bower follows.]

To this it is answered, that the letters had been published [? had the letters been published] as the letters of an honest man; [? man,] to have proved them false would be to prove them spurious, but that it can be no matter of wonder that the letters of a liar should contain lies. . . .

This seems to me a fair specimen of what may be called Johnson's judicial style—a clear, bald narrative interspersed with occasional shrewd comments (the reasoning of the last paragraph quoted seems to have been too close

for the *Literary Magazine's* compositor to follow). Another good example of this style can be found in the body of Johnson's review of Tytler's examination of the 'casket letters' attributed to Mary Queen of Scots (*Gentleman's Magazine*, October 1760). A continuation of the report on the Bower controversy is given in No. 9 of the *Magazine*, pp. 442-53, but this consists only of quotations without editorial comment.

Item 65 is in a bald, 'reportorial' style similar to that of items 9 and 28. Like them, it could conceivably be an 'abstract' by Johnson. The concluding paragraph sounds a little more distinctively 'Johnsonian':

After this view of the islands it is no hard matter to judge of their importance, and of how much consequence it is to keep them out of the hands of the French, who have made several attempts to become masters of them, but hitherto their designs have proved abortive. We shall only observe at present, that they are extremely well seated to annoy our perfidious neighbours in time of war, and we may guess what they can do by what they have already done on former occasions.

Item 67 is a continuation of the *Historical Memoirs* that form item 42. I quote the first three paragraphs of this instalment; the second and third strike me as Johnsonian, but I rather doubt the first:

In our last we laid before the public some important facts, which paved the way for our enemies to excite in our friendly Indians in North America that jealousy of our proceedings, which has so easily inclin'd them to take up the hatchet against us.

While the French have been endeavouring by every artifice that human policy could suggest to establish an interest among them, our Governors there, trusting to the increasing strength of the rising colonies, or perhaps having an eye only to their present gain, have for a series of years past taken no care to cultivate new friendships with the ancient inhabitants, nor has the government been at much expence to cement the old.

A people, therefore, thus neglected by one foreign nation, and courted by another, could not remain for ever in doubt to which side to join their force. War was both their pride and their profession; and they saw this additional motive to determine their choice, that the French were in general poor, active, and enterprising; the English wealthy, laborious, and peaceable; hence they could not but conclude that as the spoils would be greater by warring against the latter, the hazard in obtaining those spoils would also be less.

V

Literary Magazine, Vol. I, No. 4 (15 July to 15 August 1756):

- J 69. pp. [161]-5 Observations on the Present State of Affairs (Davies)
 NJ 70. 165-6 Some Account of the Vinegar of the four Thieves . . . in a letter to the Author

384 GREENE: JOHNSON AND LITERARY MAGAZINE

- NJ 71. 166-7 Of Nitre . . . by Mr. Woulfe
J 72. 167-8 Review of Lucas's *Essay on Waters* (continued in Nos. 5 and 6) (Gleig)
? 73. 169-71 Review of Peter Whalley's *Works of Ben Jonson*
J 74. 171-6 Review of Keith's *Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops* (Boswell)
J 75. 176-85 Review of Patrick Browne's *History of Jamaica* (Boswell)
? 76. 186 Review of *A Sermon Preached at St. John's in Southwark* . . . by John Free, D.D.
? 77. 186-7 Review of *An Impartial Account of the Invasion under William, Duke of Normandy*, by Charles Parkin
? 78. 188-90 Review of *A Scheme for preventing a further Increase of the National Debt, and for reducing the same.* . . .
? 79. 191-3 Review of *An Account of the Conferences held, and Treaties made, between major-general Sir William Johnson, and the chief sachems and warriors of the Mohawks, Onondagas, Cayugas, Senekas* [and nine other Indian tribes] . . .
J 80. 193-7 Review of *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Vol. XLIX, Part I* (Boswell)
NJ 81. 197 List of Books and Pamphlets Published
NJ 82. 198-200 A View of the Importance of GIBRALTAR, tending to remove all suspicions that no better care will be taken of that important Fortress than has been taken of Minorca
NJ 83. 200-1 Reprint of *The Connoisseur*, No. 132
NJ 84. 201-3 Articles of Capitulation proposed by General Blakeney for the garrison of St. Philip, Minorca
NJ 85. 203-5 Character of General Blakeney. From the *Westminster Journal*
NJ 86. 205-7 Account of the Plot in Sweden
NJ 87. 208-9 Poetry
? 88. 210-13 Historical Memoirs (continued)
NJ 89. 213-[14] Chronological Diary, &c.

Item 70 is a pharmaceutical note contributed as a supplement to item 56. In spite of Johnson's interest in pharmacy, this is more probably a genuine contribution by an outsider. Item 82 is written in a pedestrian style and controverts the views expressed by Johnson (as I think) in item 4 above. See also item 48. Item 84 is a reprint of a document, and item 86 is mostly quotation from dispatches from Sweden, though its introductory sentence could be Johnson's.

There seems no harm in attributing to Johnson the one original sentence in item 73,

This is one of those works which do not easily admit of an abstract, we shall therefore only exhibit a compendious life of the authour, taken from Mr. Whalley's larger account,

and the succinct introduction to some passages from the political sermon noticed in item 76;

This sermon seems to contain as much history as divinity. It is introduced by a short preface, in which are the following passages. . . .

Item 77 is undoubtedly Johnson's:

This pamphlet is published to prove what nobody will deny, that we shall be less happy if we were conquered by the French. The intention of the author is undoubtedly good, but his labour is superfluous at a time when all ranks of people are unanimously zealous and active against our enemies; and when indeed there is no great danger of invasions while we have the sea covered with our ships, and maintain fifty thousand men in arms on our coasts. . . .

For other expressions of Johnson's anti-alarmist views at this time, see the *Observations* on the Anglo-Russian and Anglo-Hessian treaties (item 45) and his review of *The Conduct of the Ministry Impartially Examined* (L.M. 7, pp. 340 [bis]-351), with its delightful peroration:

In one of his pages he [the author of the pamphlet] just mentions the invasion with which we were threatened in the beginning of the year, over which, however, he chuses to throw a total veil. Surely he would not have us forget the alarm which frightened some of our women to strong waters, and our parliament to Hanoverian troops. Let us not forget the flat-bottomed boats, built, I suppose, in the clouds, and now lost in the clouds again. Again, let us not forget, that when any nation is to be fleeced, it is first to be frightened.

Item 78 is with equal certainty Johnson's:

This pamphlet seems to be written with a very honest intention by a man better acquainted with arithmetic than with style.

He begins by asserting what no man doubts, and no honest man pretends to doubt, that the French have gained upon our commerce, and that the national debt has swelled so high that it can be no longer safely enlarged. [Four paragraphs of quotation from the pamphlet follow.]

The gibe at Johnson's favourite butts, the excise commissioners, sounds familiar:

To this no objection can be made, but that it cannot be discovered by common eyes, why the debt should be kept up to forty millions. Why should not it be reduced to twenty,—why not to nothing? why should not all these wretches that live on public misery, commissioners of excise, and officers without number, be at once, if it be possible, discarded, and sent to gain a living by honest industry, or to beg it of those whom they are now insulting?

The striking opening of item 79 is similar to that of other reviews in the *Magazine*, and no doubt Johnson's:

A book with such words on the first page might easily frighten a reader from

turning to the second. And indeed these conferences are more important than entertaining; they however enable us to form some conceptions of the manners of the wild nations.

The remainder is narrative and quotation.

Possible Johnsonian touches in item 88 seem to me fewer than in the two preceding instalments of the *Historical Memoirs*. The following passage, apropos of a resolution of the States-General of Holland, might be one; it is certainly in keeping with the views expressed by Johnson elsewhere—e.g. in *The Political State of Great Britain*—on the policy of that country: Such are the sentiments and such the conduct of a people who have cost Great-Britain millions to support, and for whose emolument she sacrifices the most beneficial branches of her trade. But ingratitude is and will be the necessary consequence of ill-placed generosity.

VI

Literary Magazine, Vol. I, No. 5 (15 August to 15 September 1756):

- | | | |
|---------|------------|---|
| NJ 90. | pp. 217-18 | [Notes on the naval engagement off Minorca.] |
| NJ 91. | 218-24 | Minutes of General Fowke's Court Martial |
| J 92. | 225-9 | Continuation of review of Lucas's <i>Essay on Waters</i> (see 72 above) |
| NJ 93. | 229-30 | An Account of Worms in Animal Bodies |
| NJ 94. | 230-1 | Operation on the Eustachian Tube |
| ? 95. | 231-4 | Review of R. Lovett, <i>The Subtil Medium Proved</i> |
| ? 96. | 234-9 | Review of <i>Observations of a Series of Electrical Experiments</i> . By Dr. Hoadly and Mr. Wilson, F.R.S. |
| J 97. | 239-40 | Continuation of review of Blackwell's <i>Memoirs of the Court of Augustus</i> (see 17 above) ¹ |
| J 98. | 240-7 | Review of <i>Travels through Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, Switzerland, Italy and Lorrain</i> , by John George Keyser (attributed to Johnson by Arthur Sherbo, in <i>R.E.S.</i> , N.S. vi (1955), 70-71) |
| NJ 99. | 247 | List of Books and Pamphlets published |
| NJ 100. | 248-51 | A View of the Importance of our Plantations in America, to their Mother Country |
| NJ 101. | 251-7 | Account of the Supplies granted in the last Session of Parliament |
| NJ 102. | 257-9 | An exact State of the French Marine |
| NJ 103. | 260-2 | Poetry |
| NJ 104. | 263-6 | Historical Memoirs (continued) |
| NJ 105. | 266-72 | Chronological Diary, &c. |

Items 90, 91, 101, and 102 are documentary and statistical. Items 93 and 94 are reprinted (without acknowledgement) from *Phil. Trans.*, xlix. i.

¹ Courtney does not list this continuation.

The poorly written item 100 is decidedly not Johnson's. It puts forward the expansionist, Pittite view of colonization vigorously combated by Johnson from as early as 1738, if the *State of Affairs in Lilliput* (*Gentleman's Magazine*, June 1738) is his (as I think it is),¹ until as late as 1775, in *Taxation no Tyranny* and the *Journey to the Western Islands*. He combated it nowhere more vigorously than in the columns of the *Literary Magazine* itself. 'Hither her [Britain's] poor may retire', the writer of the present article says of America,

and . . . raise to themselves handsome fortunes, as many have already done in a few years, who would have languished under remediless poverty, or been the drones of the community had they continued in their mother-country.

Johnson had already demolished a less fatuous presentation of the same argument in his *Observations on A Letter from a French Refugee in America* (item 23 above). The *Historical Memoirs* (item 104) are now distinctly un-Johnsonian and flagrantly partisan (Pittite): in the parliamentary opposition to the Anglo-Russian and Anglo-Hessian treaties,

among the most eminent patriots who distinguished themselves, to their immortal honour, on this occasion, were the hon. Mr. Pitt . . . the hon. Charles Townsend, esq. . . . a youth of a noble family and most promising abilities. . . . Others there were of superior rank, and no less merit, who thought themselves obliged in honour to themselves, in justice to their country, and in duty to their sovereign to follow the glorious example.

Items 95 (running head, 'On the Progress of Electricity') and 96 are, I am sure, by Johnson, whose interest in electricity is well known (see W. K. Wimsatt's *Philosophic Words* (New Haven, 1948), and items 49 and 51 above). The following are excerpts from the two reviews:

Electricity is the great discovery of the present age, and the great object of philosophical curiosity. It is perhaps designed by providence for the excitement of human industry, that the qualities of bodies should be discovered gradually from time to time. How many wonders may yet lie hid in every particle of matter no man can determine. The power of electricity is sufficient to shew us that nature is far from being exhausted, and that we have yet much to do before we shall be fully acquainted with the properties of these things which are always in our hands and before our eyes.

The writer of this pamphlet pretends not to learning, but he seems at least to be diligent in his enquiries, and faithful in his relations. The main works we shall perhaps not examine, but we exhibit here his introduction which contains a history of Electricity that may give some entertainment to those who are not yet much versed in philosophical studies. . . .

¹ The piece is the introduction to the *Debates in the Senate of Lilliput*. It is reprinted in Benjamin Hoover's *Samuel Johnson's Parliamentary Reporting* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953), pp. 172-81. Hoover and Hill (*Life*, i. 502) seem to accept it.

This series of observations and experiments will undoubtedly be received with uncommon regard by the inquisitive and speculative, being the product of two men, of whom one is eminent for mathematical learning, and the other for experimental curiosity, and both at once the favourites of those who cultivate the abstruser and politer arts. . . .

Whether the existence of this aether, which is perhaps but the *materia subtilis* with a new name, is proved from the following experiments, may perhaps appear when we examine them. . . . That repulsion from other matter by which aether must be thus condensed as much requires a cause as gravitation, and to create a matter so different from all other matter, as to gravitate only towards itself, is perhaps one of the arts of a philosopher unwilling to be silent when he has nothing to say. Surely the *primum mobile* with the cycles and epicycles afforded solutions with which importunity might be equally silenced and curiosity equally satisfied.

VII

I have scrutinized the next eight numbers of the *Literary Magazine* with equal care, and the remainder of the file more cursorily,¹ finding only one other item besides those already listed in Courtney that struck me as possibly Johnsonian. This is a notice in Vol. I, No. 7, p. 333; I give it in full:

(106)

A Hint to the Publick.

The present high price of corn is so great a calamity, that the strictest enquiry ought to be made, whether it be a necessary consequence of the failure of this year's crop, or whether it is not the effect of private cunning. It must be granted, that the continual supply of the navy and army, at this time, considerably encreases the consumption, but as we have not for a long time had a scarce year, the price of corn has risen more than in proportion to the demand; it follows that there must be a sufficient stock in the hands of private persons to supply the public necessities. Why are they not compelled to bring it to market? The *Germans*, in this time of scarcity, prohibited the use of grain in the distillery; and if the *British* government does not interpose, many of our poor must perish or become an additional tax upon the parish.

The call for greater government control over the grain trade is in keeping with Johnson's views in his 'Considerations on the Corn Laws' found among Gerard Hamilton's papers and assigned by Malone to 1766.

There emerges, then, from this re-examination of the *Literary Magazine*, first, the possibility of attributing to Johnson a dozen or so pieces

¹ With the exception of the number for April 1758, which is missing from what is apparently the only recorded file of Volume III of the *Literary Magazine* in existence, that at Yale. The only other 'complete' run of the *Magazine* listed by Hazen in his census (*Prefaces and Dedications*, p. 125), that in the British Museum, was destroyed during the Second World War.

of journalistic writing in addition to those already attributed by Davies, Gleig, Boswell, and the others. They may be grouped as follows:

(a) Ten reviews—items 11 (White's *Collateral Bee-Boxes*); 73 (Whalley's *Jonson*); 76 (Free's *Sermon*); 77 (Parkin's *Invasion of William of Normandy*); 78 (*A Scheme for Preventing an Increase in the National Debt*); 79 (*Sir William Johnson's Conferences with Indian Tribes*); 95 (Lovett's *Subtil Medium Proved*); 96 (Hoadly and Wilson's *Electrical Experiments*); 98 (Keysler's *Travels*—confirming Sherbo's recent attribution); and item 31, which, with its paragraph of comment on Ames's 'Of Ancient Characters', is tantamount to a review. Many of these are excessively slight, though some of the reviews attributed by Boswell are equally slight; others contain valuable political and philosophical comment.

(b) Two longer articles, their nucleus a summary of recent publications, but serving as a vehicle for fairly extensive and important comment. These are items 4 (*History of Minorca*) and 57 (*Abstract of the Charge and Defence of Archibald Bower*). The latter is of considerable interest to Johnsonian biography.

(c) Johnsonian 'touches', at least, in the *Historical Memoirs* (items 18, 42, 67, 88) of the first four numbers, which may legitimately be regarded as a single connected composition.

These thirteen items (as I count them) should, I feel, be at least tentatively added to the canon. The following might, I think, have been written by Johnson:

(d) three pieces of very bare (and no doubt almost entirely derivative) description—items 9 (*Account of the Manatee*), 28 (*Account of the Sea-Bear*), and 65 (*Account of the Channel Islands*). As I have said, these are comparable to similar zoological and geographical accounts in *A Voyage to Abyssinia* and the *Journey to the Western Islands*; but they are so extremely 'objective' as to add almost nothing to our knowledge of Johnson's mind, and they hardly seem worth arguing over. Item 106 (*A Hint to the Publick*) is of so anomalous a nature among the other Johnsonian contributions that I hesitate to ascribe it.

Another point emerges from this examination, which I think reinforces the argument for the attributions, as well as possessing some (biographical) interest in itself. I have taken care to indicate, wherever I could, the sources of the non-Johnsonian items in these first five numbers in order to emphasize the fact that during this time Johnson must have been almost the sole 'staff writer' (the contemporary term 'author' seems to apply very well) of the periodical: when one deducts such things as the reprints from *Philosophical Transactions* and the *Connoisseur* and *World*, the texts of official documents, and the sporadic signed contributions from Woulfe,

'Gallo-Anglus', and other 'outsiders', there is very little left of the magazine but Johnson. That is, of course, if the Boswell-Courtney and the present attributions are accepted. If some of them are not, the sceptic must postulate a colleague, a pseudo-Johnson, whose style and whose views on morals and politics are almost indistinguishable from the true Johnson's; and the task of discriminating between these two excellent writers will be difficult indeed. It is possible, of course, that Johnson did have an assistant who compiled the Chronological Diary, edited the poetry page, and—perhaps—wrote the first draft of the *Historical Memoirs*.¹ It is possible that this subordinate may have been capable of composing the sentence or two that constitutes a few of the more trivial of the reviews, or the descriptions of the manatee and the sea-bear. Yet even these latter, bare as the genre is, are written in language of great competence and in a style remarkably close to that of similar descriptions in known pieces of Johnson; and some of the shortest of the reviews bear the impress of an intellect so confident and a wit so incisive that it is hard to see who else than Johnson, in the circumstances, could have written them.

A final point. To the first four numbers of the *Magazine* Johnson contributed extensively on political as well as literary and scientific matters. To numbers 5, 6, and 7 (apart from the possibility of item 106 above) he contributed the reviews, the *Life of Frederick the Great* (continued in numbers 8 and 9), and nothing else. After this, nothing more of his seems to have appeared in the *Magazine* except the pieces on Hanway and Soame Jenyns in numbers 13, 14, and 15. Why, we may wonder, did Johnson's connexion with the *Magazine*, whose early numbers he so overwhelmingly dominated, terminate in this almost abrupt fashion?

It seems to me that the evidence of the contents of the first five numbers suggests an answer—that Johnson and the owners or directors of the *Magazine* came to disagree completely on what its political tendency should be. In the very month when the first issue of the *Magazine* appeared, the official declaration of what was to be the Seven Years' War was made. It was a time of bitter political struggle in Britain: the government of Newcastle, the political heir of Walpole, the representative of the landed Whig aristocracy and the vested interests of the state trading monopolies of the South Sea and East India Companies, was being attacked with the utmost vigour by the group of Whigs led by William Pitt, representing the 'free trading' independent business interests of London and Bristol, who were continually chafing against the cautious and conservative policy of the Walpolian Whigs in international affairs and continually urging British territorial and commercial expansion. Twenty years before, the two groups had

¹ Professor Arthur Sherbo suggests to me that the role of Griffith Jones (see *D.N.B.*) in the *L.M.* might be explored in this connexion.

fought a grim battle (in which Johnson had played a part), when the Pittite faction had forced Walpole into a war with Spain (on behalf of commerce) and eventually brought about Walpole's downfall. In the mid-1750's the embers of the same strife flared up again.

It is apparent at a glance that the *Literary Magazine*, in spite of its name, was throughout its career a political organ. Its politics at the outset were distinctly anti-Newcastle. It was known that Johnson was certainly no great lover of the Walpole-Newcastle Whig 'connexion', and the entrepreneur of the *Magazine* (whoever that may have been) might well have had that thought in mind when inviting Johnson to 'superintend' it.

Johnson evidently accepted the invitation with pleasure, and entered exuberantly into the sport of knocking the Whig dogs on the head, as the very first article in the *Magazine* indicates. But that Johnson disapproved of Newcastle by no means entailed that he approved of Pitt. Johnson's political contributions to the *Magazine* manifest a clear, consistent, and emphatic set of opinions: he is anti-commercialist, anti-imperialist, anti-expansionist, in the 'old Tory' tradition, which was closer to Walpole and Newcastle in these matters than it was to Pitt. When Minorca was on the point of being lost by Britain, Johnson had the audacity to proclaim that it was probably a good thing, and that it would be even better if Gibraltar were to be lost too (item 4 above). The protests at once began to come in—from a British merchant trading in the Near East (item 48), from an indignant patriot (item 82). The letter from the American 'patriot' Gallo-Anglus (item 22) is curious: dated 'August 1, 1755', long before the *Magazine* was even announced, by whose hand was it transmitted, and why was it published at all? Through the mediation of the ownership of the *Magazine*? Johnson published it and then demolished it; but he must have been chagrined to see, in number 5, all the cant about the colonies that he had thundered against once more rehearsed (item 99). In the same number, a new and 'patriotic' hand took over the *Historical Memoirs* (item 103).

From this time Johnson's contributions were confined to the review columns (though even there he had considerable scope for political comment, as in his reviews of pamphlets on the affair of Admiral Byng). In November 1756, however, Newcastle resigned and Pitt became Prime Minister for a short time; by the spring, Newcastle and Pitt had reconciled their differences in a coalition ministry that brought the war to a successful conclusion, resulting in the acquisition of enormous territories and vastly increased markets for British commerce. In November 1756 Johnson ceased to contribute regularly to the *Literary Magazine*: a spirit of criticism of the government's 'war effort', which had been appropriate when Pitt was in opposition, was no longer wanted. At any rate, whether it was

through the accidents of shifting political alliances, or through an actual change in the ownership of the *Magazine* (which its variety of imprints may well indicate), the periodical now became violently patriotic, completely reversing the attitude toward the war that had been expressed by Johnson. Its frontispiece for the collected volumes, which in 1756 had shown an allegorical female figure surrounded by smiling arts and sciences, in 1757 exhibited an armed Britannia ferociously stabbing the repulsive dragon of France. In January 1758, regardless of absurdity, it adopted the style of the *Literary and Antigallican Magazine*. In July 1758 it quietly expired.

BIRDS IN THE POETRY OF BROWNING

By THOMAS P. HARRISON

THE subject of Browning's birds immediately suggests *Home-Thoughts, from Abroad* with its chaffinch that 'sings on the orchard bough', its nesting white-throat, and especially the famous description of the thristle, which

sings each song twice over,
Lest you should think he never could recapture
The first fine careless rapture! (16)

Yet however memorable as a picture of an English spring, especially in its birds, this lyric is least characteristic of the author. A few such allusions come direct from the poet, most from his characters. Irrespective of context most of his allusions reflect extensive and minute observation, though on occasion it is obvious that Browning used bird names without any knowledge of their owner. In this as in other phases of his art Browning delights in the unusual, the unappreciated, and the unexpected. The present purpose is to illustrate both the kinds of interest Browning possessed and the ways in which he regarded the world of birds as an aid to poetic ends.

With Browning's peculiar fondness for animals,¹ it is not surprising to find his poetry filled with birds. Apart from compounds like *brood-bird*, *night-bird*, and the like, Browning uses *bird* and *birds* 162 times, and names 72 species,² a dozen more than Tennyson, who is more widely recognized as

¹ 'There is no poet whose love of animals is greater than Browning's, and none who has so frequently, so carefully, so vividly described them', wrote Stopford Brooke, *The Poetry of Robert Browning* (London, 1902), p. 83. Cf. 'The Treatment of Nature' (pp. 57-114), still the best consideration of this subject, and the brief studies by Elisabeth L. Carey, 'Browning and the Animal Kingdom' (*The Critic*, xliii (1903), 163-5) and by Esther Matson, 'A Triad of Symbols: the Bird, the Star, and the Circle as used by Robert Browning' (*Poet-Lore*, xxxi (1920), 284-90).

² Allusions to birds named below but not mentioned elsewhere in this study may readily be located in Broughton and Stelter, *Concordance to the Poems of Robert Browning* (New York, 1924-5; 2 vols.). Names appearing in parentheses are those Browning used, sometimes with descriptive lines indicating ignorance of the bird itself. *Land birds*: black-bird, chaffinch, white-throat, thristle ('thrush'), mistle-thrush, nightingale, robin, sky-lark, linnet, cuckoo, swallow, wren, bullfinch, bramble-finch, house-sparrow ('sparrow'), ortolan, fieldfare, martin, nuthatch, starling, rook, magpie, jackdaw, raven, carrion crow, jay, wood-pigeon ('cushat'), turtle dove, domestic pigeon, goshawk, peregrine ('tercel'), lanner falcon, merlin, sparrow hawk, kite, osprey, ossifrage, tawny owl ('owl'), scops owl ('cue owl'), nightjar ('nighthawk'), vulture, gier-eagle, golden eagle, sea eagle, hoopoe, quail, pheasant, partridge, grouse, woodcock ('beccaccia'). *Shore and water birds*: lapwing, curlew, kingfisher, sandpiper, stork, crane, little grebe ('dabchick'), coot, heron, swan, auk, cormorant, gull, gannet, snow goose, sea-duck. *Foreign birds* (non-European): bowerbird, ostrich, ibis, hummingbird ('bee bird'), bobolink, parrot ('lory', 'popinjay').

a poet of birds.¹ Even these general allusions point to Browning's pleasure in the quieter aspects of bird life, and they give earnest of his special interest in nesting birds: 'a bird that grieves For callow nestlings some rude hand bereaves' (*Aristophanes' Apology*, 1122); 'like a hurt bird's complaint' (*Pauline*, 73), a spring to which 'some wild bird Stoop for its freshness from the trackless air' (*ibid.*, 177), 'where small birds reel and winds take their delight' (*ibid.*, 790); 'the noisy flock of thievish birds' (*Sordello*, 1. 451); 'there the coppice rang with singing birds' (*The Ring and the Book*, 5. 874), 'as the wide faultless white on the bird's breast' (*ibid.*, 10. 1224), 'as brood-bird when you saunter past her eggs' (*ibid.*, 11. 1319); 'Birds assemble for their bedtime, soft the tree-top swell subsides' (*La Saisiaz*, 397); 'The birds' quiet singing, that tells us What life is, so clear?' (*The Englishman in Italy*, 223). The characteristic quality in such passages will become more apparent in allusions to specific birds, whose peculiar habits and songs Browning knew from observation.

Among the famous song-birds, it is not difficult to discover which were Browning's favourites. Chaffinch and white-throat, already mentioned, he does not allude to again. Twice only does he name the blackbird—its tune suggested by 'the bean-flowers' boon . . . And May, and June' (*De Gustibus*, 11-13); for this bird he once uses the old name, merle, in 'mavis, merle, and throstle' (*Pippa Passes*, 4. 326). Here throstle, or song-thrush, is the 'wise thrush' of *Home-Thoughts*, as also in 'fresh-blown thrush eggs on a thread', to which blue eyes are aptly compared (*Sordello*, 4. 286). Hence 'mavis', properly the throstle, Browning seems wrongly to have identified with mistle-thrush, to which he once refers by name in its familiar role as weather prophet:

and may the summer flowers gush
Without a warning from the missel thrush. (*Sordello*, 3. 974)

'Lark' refers to the sky-lark, and probably also to the less common but equally appealing wood-lark, both famous for their flight songs. Browning's lines show genuine feeling: the lark 'soars up and up, shivering for very joy' (*Paracelsus*, 5. 676); it is 'day's apostle'; a man 'wrapt around by verse, Encircled with poetic atmosphere' is like 'lark emballed by its own crystal song' (*Aristophanes*, 2162-4); 'Day's the song-time for the lark' (*Jocoseria*, 521). Of a child 'barefoot and rosy',

Up and up goes he, singing all the while
Some unintelligible words to beat
The lark, God's poet, swooning at his feet. . . . (*Sordello*, 6. 866)

¹ 'Of all poets of established reputation he [Tennyson] heads the list for the number of birds which he mentions', states Watkin Watkins, *The Birds of Tennyson* (London, n.d.), p. 24, on the basis of a total of sixty. Cf. further Morton Luce, 'Nature in Tennyson: Birds', *Living Age*, cclxxxvii (1915), 156-61.

Traditionally the nightingale and the cuckoo announce the spring by their first notes after arrival. Browning has a handful of casual allusions to the nightingale which show that he never accepts this magnificent singer as he does the cuckoo:

Sure, he's arrived,
The tell-tale cuckoo: spring's his confidant,
And he lets out her April purposes! (*Pippa Passes*, 3. 140)

However striking such passages, clearly Browning did not share Tennyson's absorbed interest in bird song. He was more attracted by other aspects of the life of certain birds, the common wood- or ring-dove, for example: 'the brood-song of the cushat-dove' (*A Forest Thought*, 52), 'the dove's brood-song' (*Sordello*, 1. 774), 'the cushat's chirre' (*ibid.*, 6. 788), 'grieving, by minors, like the cushat-dove' (*Red Cotton*, 1. 268). In this last poem the nest of the 'white domestic pigeon . . . bestowing egg In authorised compartment, warm and safe' is finely contrasted with

a veriest trap of twigs
On tree-top, every straw a thievery,
Where the wild dove—despite the fowler's snare,
The sportsman's shot, the urchin's stone—crooned gay,
And solely gave her heart to what she hatched,
Nor minded a malignant world below. (2. 724)

Once he refers to the habitat of another of this numerous family, the rock dove; 'past the high rocks, the haunt of doves' (*Paracelsus*, 2. 542).

Before turning to further and more characteristic illustrations of Browning's fascination with nesting, mention should be made of two other birds which he introduces solely for his pleasure in them. The first is the swallow: 'The morning swallows with their songs like words' (*Pauline*, 135); 'The swallow has set her six young on the rail' (*James Lee's Wife*, 3. 1); 'the swallows soaring their eternal curve' (*Sordello*, 6. 748)—the last is more descriptive of swifts; 'the manner of the swallow's come and go' (*The Ring*, 5. 940); 'there goes a swallow to Venice—the stout sea-farer' (*Pippa*, 3. 230). Evidently Browning had observed the habits and song of this summer resident. Thinking of migrants, he names its congener, the house-martin:

She says, 'God put it in my head to fly,
As when the martin migrates: autumn claps
Her hands, cries "Winter's coming, will be here."' '
(*The Ring*, 3. 1418)

Browning's allusions to the kingfisher show a peculiar interest in this

bird, as beautiful as it is famous in the lore of every land. The first occurs in the well-known description of the Main in *Paracelsus*:

And scarce it pushes
 Its gentle way through straggling rushes
 Where the glossy kingfisher
 Flutters when noon-heats are near,
 Glad the shelving banks to shun,
 Red and steaming in the sun,
 Where the shrew-mouse with pale throat
 Burrows, and the speckled stoat;
 Where the quick sandpipers flit
 In and out the marl and grit
 That seems to breed them, brown as they:
 Nought disturbs its 'quiet way,
 Save some lazy stork that springs,
 Trailing it with legs and wings,
 Whom the shy fox from the hill
 Rouses, creep he ne'er so still. (5. 446)¹

Such description for its own sake Browning rarely essays. But his kingfisher reappears in *The Ring*, 11. 12 and 2355, and finally in *Furini* with a legend of Joan of Arc:

Now as she fain would bathe, one even-tide,
 God's maid, this Joan, from the pool's edge she spied
 The fair blue bird clowns call the Fisher-king:
 And "Las," sighed she, 'my Liege is such a thing
 As thou, lord but of one poor lonely place
 Out of his whole wide France: were mine the grace
 To set my Dauphin free as thou, blue bird!
 Properly Martin-fisher—that's the word. (608)²

(Browning's son painted a picture of Joan bathing.) The last line may reflect the French *oiseau de Saint Martin* and *martin pêcheur*, from the halcyon legend about the bird's incubation for seven days before and after the winter solstice; Shakespeare alludes to 'St. Martin's summer, halcyon

¹ Sandpipers appear nowhere else, but in *The Flight* is a marsh:

Where never sound yet was
 Save the dry quick clap of the stork's bill,
 For the air is still, and the water still,
 When the blue breast of the dipping coot
 Dives under, and all is mute. (668)

(But the coot's plumage is sooty black.)

² In the neighbourhood of Metz the kingfisher is called the 'blue bird', according to Charles Swainson, *Provincial Names and Folk Lore of British Birds* (London, 1885), p. 105. Cf. Tennyson's 'sea-blue bird of March' (*In Memoriam*).

days' (1 *Henry VI*, 1. ii. 131). Or possibly Browning's 'Martin' may also be a nickname, as in Magpie, Jackdaw, Mollern.

So much, then, for birds as poetic embellishment, enhancing the mood and expressing directly a phase of nature which Browning had learned from his youth. This traditional role is common to all poets who have taken pleasure in the outdoors. But Browning perceived another poetic function of bird life, and this proves to be far more characteristic. For him birds in their varied activities provide what he terms 'the feathered parallel' to human life, which becomes more intelligible once the parallel has been fully perceived. The authors of the medieval bestiaries regarded the life of nature as a mine providing infinite ethical analogies for human guidance. Though he is not often occupied with moral issues, Browning similarly turns to bird life for instructive analogy. The following passages are illustrative.

Appropriately enough, *Paracelsus* contains an avian parallel in which the intuitive hero links his faith with that of birds:¹

I see my way as birds their trackless way.
I shall arrive! what time, what circuit first,
I ask not: but unless God sends his hail
Or blinding fireballs, sleet or stifling snow,
In some good time, his good time, I shall arrive:
He guides me and the bird. In his good time! (1. 565)²

With somewhat similar assurance Pompilia justifies her purpose:

The bird brings hither sticks and hairs and wool,
And nowhere else i' the world; . . .
I have my purpose and my motive too,
My march to Rome, like any bird or fly! (*The Ring*, 7. 1235)

Both these passages express the affinity of human faith in a destined course

¹ 'Man', says Paracelsus, 'need not be surprised that animals have animal instincts that are so much like his own. . . . Man may learn from the animals, for they are his parents.' Quoted by George W. Cooke, *A Guide-book to the Poetic and Dramatic Works of Robert Browning* (Boston and New York, 1891), p. 263.

² Cf. *Paracelsus*:

Be sure that God
Ne'er dooms to waste the strength he deems impart:
Ask the gier-eagle why she stoops at once
Into the vast and unexplored abyss,
What full-grown power informs her from the first,
Why she not marvels, strenuously beating
The silent boundless regions of the sky! (1. 353)

The gier-eagle (gier = Dutch *geir* 'vulture') is the Egyptian vulture or Pharaoh's hen (see p. 400, n. 2). Browning probably remembers it only as a biblical name (see p. 404 below), though he could have known the bird in Italy. 'I have never seen an Egyptian Vulture flap its wings', writes Professor M. F. M. Meiklejohn, to whom I am indebted for valuable aid throughout.

of action with the unwavering instincts of bird or fly as thus Browning projects himself into the thought of his dramatic characters. His detailed description of nests illustrates that poetic quality noted by Professor Herford—a vivid awareness 'of surface and texture, of space, solidity, shape'.¹ Three poems further illustrate this motif.

Elaborately the poet introduces his discovery of the organ music of the old master, Charles Avison, with a tale. On a garden wall, a March snow falling, the poet sees a 'blackcap' tugging at a 'cloth-shred, still a-flutter from its nail That fixed a spray once'. The bird, 'no townsman but born orchard-thief', has travelled far to fetch this for its nest, disdaining 'moss-tuft, beard from sheaf Of sun-scorched barley, horsehairs long and stout, All proper country-pillage'. This cloth-shred was 'booty sure to set his wife's each wing Greenly a-quiver':

How they climb and cling,
Hang parrot-wise to bough, these blackcaps! Strange
Seemed to a city-dweller that the finch
Should stray so far to forage: . . .

Yet, as Browning now comes to the parallel,

This was scarce stranger than that memory, . . .
must straight clap pinion, well nigh roam
A century back, nor once close plume, descry
The appropriate rag to plunder, till she pounced—

on the name of Avison, 'whilom of Newcastle organist',

whose little book
And large tune thus had led me the long way
(As late a rag my blackcap) from today. . . .

(Charles Avison, 27-125)

As the analogy concludes, the reader perhaps feels that in the process Browning has travelled even farther than his blackcap, that, for the moment, the poet's interest lies more in bird than musician. His bird is not the blackcap, the well-known migratory warbler, but the black-capped bullfinch, a permanent resident which notoriously feeds upon orchard buds. (Browning would hardly have called one of the tits, cole or willow, a 'finch'.) Elsewhere he refers to the bullfinch by name ('bullfinch bubbings', *Flute-Music*, 3); but often he uses a second and alternative name.

This capricious avian habit of seeking city material again appears in

¹ C. H. Herford, *Robert Browning* (Edinburgh and London, 1905), p. 244. Cf. also John K. Bonnell, 'Touch Images in the Poetry of Robert Browning', *P.M.L.A.*, xxvii (1922), 574-98.

Fifine at the Fair to show that 'they, of the wild, require some touch of us the tame':

the bird must dare a dash at something good:
Must snatch up, bear away in beak, the trifle treasure,
To wood and wild, and then . . .
Was never tree-built nest, you climbed and took, of bird
(Rare city-visitant, talked of, scarce seen or heard),
But, when you would dissect the structure, piece by piece,
You found, enwreathed amid the country-product—fleece
And feather, thistle-fluffs and bearded windle-straws—
Some shred of foreign silk, unravelling of gauze,
Bit, may be, of brocade, mid fur and blow-bell-down,
Filched plainly from mankind, dear tribute paid by town,
. . . the how and why of which,
'That is the secret, there the mystery that stings! (83 ff.)

So those who forsake society return to sell wares 'Since clothing, meat and drink, mean money all the same'. But this minute catalogue of nest material surely discloses the poet who has actually dissected the structure piece by piece to discover its components and has pondered their origins.

Not only nesting materials but the varied architecture of nests now serve the poet in a final elaborate analogy. Perhaps prompted by the expression 'to feather one's nest', Browning goes far and near to build his bridge between the devious ways of humanity and the obviously utilitarian habits of birds, which the poet whimsically takes pains to deny. In feathering his nest by corrupt political dealings George Bubb Dodington mistakenly presents to the public an outward show of patriotic zeal. Let such as he bestow a thought:

How birds build nests; at outside, roughly wrought,
Twig knots with twig, loam plastered up each chink,
Leaving the inmate rudely lodged—you think?
Peep but inside! That spacious rude-and-rough
Covers a domicile where downy fluff
Embeds the ease-deserving architect,
Who toiled and moiled not merely to effect
'Twixt sprig and spray a stop-gap in the teeth
Of wind and weather, guard what swung beneath
From upset only, but contrived himself
A snug interior, warm and soft and sleek.

As to materials and habitat nature prompts each species:

Thus—pelf

Smoothens the human mudlark's lodging,¹ power

¹ Elsewhere the 'mudlark' is associated with 'slush' and 'filth' (*Aristophanes' Apology*, 2960 ff.), and again: . . . mudlarks poke now here now there,

Demands some hardier wrappage to embrace
 Robuster heart-beats: rock, not tree nor tower,
 Contents the building eagle: rook shoves close
 To brother rook on branch, while crow morose
 Apart keeps balance perched on topmost bough.
 No sort of bird but suits his taste somehow.

The poet is now reminded that 'Darwin tells of such as love the bower':

His bower-birds opportunely yield us yet
 The lacking instance when at loss to get
 A feathered parallel to what we find
 The secret motor of some mighty mind
 That worked such wonders—all for vanity! . . .
 How says the Sage?
 Birds born to strut prepare a platform-stage
 With sparkling stones and speckled shells, all sorts
 Of slimy rubbish, odds and ends and orts,
 Whereon to pose and posture and engage
 The priceless female simper.¹ (*George Bubb Dodington*, 20 ff.)

Browning has 'gone Thus into detail' to illustrate that,

just so with statesmanship
 All outside show, in short, is sham.

Except in such infrequent allusions to foreigners like Darwin's bower birds and others,² Browning's observations usually derive from direct experi-

Going their rounds to probe the ruts i' the road
 Or fish the luck o' the puddle. (*The Ring*, 4. 89)

The poet refers only to persons who grub about harbours (cf. *O.E.D.*), though 'mudlark' is also a name for the rock pipit (H. K. Swann, *Dictionary of English and Folk-Names of British Birds* (London, 1913), p. 162), a bird known also as sea-lark; cf. 'The white breast of the sea-lark twitters sweet' (*James Lee's Wife*, 7. 6). This line fits the ringed plover, which among other shore birds is called sea-lark (Charles Swainson, *op. cit.*, p. 182, and Alfred Newton, *A Dictionary of Birds* (London, 1893-6), p. 822. But, as the Rev. E. A. Armstrong suggests to me, Browning's 'mudlark' applies to no bird but 'is exactly equivalent to the French "gamin" or to "guttersnipe"').

¹ 'The bowers which . . . are decorated with feathers, shells, bones and leaves, are built on the ground for the sole purpose of courtship, for their nests are formed in trees', writes Darwin of the Australian bower-birds (*The Descent of Man* (London, 1871), ii. 69). With Darwin's preceding account of the nuptial dances of herons and other birds, cf. the comparison between Sludge, 'ware o' the spirit-world', and a prisoned crane which

feels pairing-time
 In the islands where his kind are, so must fall
 To capering by himself some shiny night,
 As if your own back-yard were a plot of spice.

(*Mr. Sludge, 'The Medium'*, 1248)

² The Arab birds which 'float sleeping in the wind' (*Pauline*, 479) have been identified as pelicans and as birds of paradise (E. Berdoo, *The Browning Cyclopaedia* (New York and

ence; and certainly these 'feathered parallels' are more engaging than are the poet's professed reasons for introducing them.

Another wide field of bird lore Browning knew intimately: birds as predators (falconry) and as victims of gun, net, and snare. Hawks the poet observed first as a picturesque feature of bird life everywhere:

What did I say?—that a small bird sings
All day long, save when a brown pair
Of hawks from the wood float with wide wings
Strained to a bell: 'gainst noon-day glare
You count the streaks and rings. (*By the Fireside*, 155)

From books Browning learned well the art and the jargon of falconry (*Pippa*, 2. 270, *The Flight of the Duchess*, 455-6, and *The Ring*, 5. 746 ff.). Count Guido has been elaborately depicting marriage in terms of falconry (*The Ring*, 5. 701 ff.). I am not one, he concludes, to treat 'my falcon-gentle like my finch'. 'Falcon-gentle' is applied to both female goshawk and peregrine, the two noblest of hawks. The goshawk is so called in *Sordello* (4. 504); the tercel (male) in *Gismond* (124); and in *The Flight* two smaller hawks:

Had they stuck on his fist a rough-foot merlin!
(Hark, the wind's on the heath at its game!
Oh for a noble falcon-lanner
To flap each broad wing like a banner.
And turn in the wind, and dance like flame!) (271)

Living for so long in Italy, Browning learned much about continental customs of netting and trapping birds for the table. *The Ring* includes allusions to the trapping of fieldfares (11. 926-7), of robins (11. 1902-5), the use of lure-owls (7. 394 and 7. 672), and, amid four avian metaphors, even the old device of 'daring' larks. Were Guido to go wife-hunting in Rome, he would find

No lack of mothers here in Rome, no dread
Of daughters lured as larks by looking-glass! (3. 338)

In earlier days mirrors were used to dazzle various small birds so that they

London, 1912), p. 331). As both legs and wings of birds of paradise were removed prior to their shipment from the East to Europe, these birds were believed never to alight and to feed only on the dews of heaven, supported in the air by their long plumes. Such plumes were sometimes thought to belong to the Arabian phoenix (see Newton, op. cit., p. 38), hence the association of the two legends may explain Browning's line. Browning once describes the legendary phoenix, which 'with ages on his plumes Travels to die in his ancestral glooms' (*Sordello*, 6. 583), but here calls it 'the king-bird', a term applying properly to one of the birds of paradise (*Paradisea regia*) or possibly to the eagle (cf. *O.E.D.*). Finally, the poet's 'lone desert bird that wears the ruff' (*A Death in the Desert*, 66) describes two birds—the Egyptian Vulture and the Hermit Ibis, both having a ruff of feathers below naked necks. It is unlikely that Browning knew either.

could be more easily netted. In *The Englishman in Italy* Browning describes a scene just before a late autumn rain breaks the heat. In early morning the quail-nets are taken down as 'Quick and sharp rang the rings down the net-poles' (35).¹

Such passages bespeak the Italian gourmet more than the English bird-lover. In the Prologue to *Ferishtah's Fancies*, to urge upon the reader to 'masticate Sense, sight and song there', Browning whimsically describes the preparation of ortolans and the flavour of the dish, which is compounded of many simples:

Pray, Reader, have you eaten ortolans
 Ever in Italy?
 Recall how cooks there cook them: . . .
 They pluck the birds,—some dozen luscious lumps,
 Or more or fewer,—
 Then roast them, heads by heads and rumps by rumps,
 Stuck on a skewer. (7)

Then with toast and sage added, the ortolan attains a rare 'gust' provided that the gourmand 'through all three bite boldly. . . . So with your meal, my poem'. The ortolan, or garden bunting,² long a favourite with Italians, is netted, then fattened for the table. In different mood the poet had protested against the decoration of women's hats with bird plumes in 'The Lady and the Painter', where the lady is

clothed with murder of His best
 Of harmless beings. (27)

Dowden recalls Mrs. Bronson's report of Browning's enjoyment of the ortolan dish and adds: 'As if the pleasure of the eye in beauty gained at a bird's expense were more criminal than the gusto of the tongue in lusciousness, curbed by piquancy, gained at the expense of a dozen other birds!'³ Though the poet's weakness for a dish of ortolans may perhaps be laid to the Italians, this avian analogy is highly characteristic. As Prologue, it ironically introduces the first poem in the series, 'The Eagle', from the *Fables of Pilpay*, where it is entitled 'The Dervish, the Falcon and the Raven'.⁴ The mother raven dead beneath her nest, young ravens are

¹ Earlier in this poem grape skins are described as:

Marked like a quail's crown
 Those creatures you make such account of,
 Whose heads,—speckled white
 Over brown like a great spider's back, . . .
 Your mother bites off for her supper. (20)

² This small bunting is oddly described as 'a kind of quail' by W. C. Devane (*A Browning Handbook* (New York, 1935), p. 428.

³ Edward Dowden, *The Life of Robert Browning* (New York and London, n.d.), p. 340.

⁴ Cf. Edward Berdoe, op. cit., pp. 142-3.

fed by an eagle which suddenly appears with flesh. The moral is that man should play the part, not of the weakling, but of 'helpful strength'.

The poet's bird-lore bears a foreign stamp in these allusions to Italian cooking, which do not necessarily conflict with a genuine devotion to the living bird. More characteristic are those passages which clearly reflect actual experience in watching familiar birds. Comparison with human act or motive is his usual manner, as in the following passage from *Cenciaja*, which perfectly exemplifies Browning's instinct for the minute and for the tactual. The Governor has examined a prisoner 'eight hours on a stretch':

all the stress
Of all examination steadily
Converging into one pin-point,—he pushed
Tentative now of head and now of heart.
As when the nuthatch taps and tries the nut
This side and that side till the kernel sound,—
So did he press the sole and single point. . . . (185)¹

No one expects the poet to be an ornithologist, yet as Edward Berdoe has truly remarked:

The poet who knows his natural history . . . will write better poetry than he who knows nothing of these things. . . . His deeper penetration into the mysteries of nature will enable him to impress us more entirely with a sense of his truth to Nature in all her varying moods and phenomena.²

By reason of their accuracy most of Browning's references to birds manifest this 'deeper penetration'. However, to complete the picture, notice should be taken of a number of allusions which betray erroneous conceptions of bird habit. It has already been observed that in accurately describing a bull-finch Browning plainly errs in calling it a 'blackcap'. Further examples occur where both names and description are solely the product of the poet's reading or imagination.

In *Caliban* perhaps the natural history is that of the monster rather than the poet. At any rate, the auk, 'one fire-eye in a ball of foam, That floats and feeds' (47), describes no member of this family of sea birds. The 'tall pouch-bill crane' (161) which disgorges its catch of fish for Caliban seems an error for cormorant, famous for this service to humanity; the tethered bird, a ring at the base of its long neck, dived for fish.

The cormorant appears in strange company with the 'ossifrage' in *Balaustion's Adventure*:

And we were just about
To turn and face the foe, as some tired bird

¹ Cf. Giotto's campanile, 'fine as the beak of a young beccaccia' (*Old Pictures in Florence*, 277). Beccaccia is Italian for woodcock.

² 'Browning's Science', *Browning's Message to His Time* (London, 1897), p. 100.

Barbarians pelt at, drive with shouts away
 From shelter in what rocks, however rude,
 She makes for, to escape the kindled eye,
 Split beak, crook'd claw o' the creature, cormorant
 Or ossifrage, that, hardly baffled, hangs
 Afloat i' the foam, to take her if she turn.
 So were we at destruction's very edge. (125)

The cormorant, a web-footed swimmer, 'hangs afloat i' the foam', but feeds exclusively upon fish. The true ossifrage, literally and etymologically a bone-breaker, is the lammergeyer or bearded vulture of southern Europe. This bird drops its prey on to the rocks from a height and thus, according to Pliny (10. 3), caused the death of Aeschylus, upon whose bald pate, mistaken for a stone, this vulture dropped a tortoise. The word *ossifrage* was corrupted into *osprey*, a bird totally different from the vulture but, from a passage in *Sordello*, also a mere name to the poet. To Browning strangely this fish hawk is abroad only in stormy weather:

'Taurello,' quoth an envoy, 'as in wane
 Dwelt at Ferrara. Like an osprey fain
 To fly but forced the earth his couch to make
 Far inland, till his friend the tempest wake,
 Waits he the Kaiser's coming; and as yet
 That fast friend sleeps, and he too sleeps; but let
 Only the billow freshen, and he snuffs
 The aroused hurricane ere it enrougns
 The sea it means to cross because of him.
 Sinketh the breeze? His hope-sick eye grows dim.' (1. 136)

Clearly Browning knew nothing of the habits of these birds; he liked the names, all three of which—cormorant, ossifrage, and osprey—with two others,¹ he probably remembered from the list of forbidden birds in Leviticus xi.

Equally inept are the lines from *The Ring* contrasting Paolo with the dabchick:

The Abate Paolo, a regular priest,
 Had long since tried his powers and found he swam
 With the deftest on the Galilean pool:
 But then he was a web-foot, free o' the wave,
 And no ambiguous dab-chick hatched to strut,
 Humbled by any fond attempt to swim
 When fiercer fowl usurped his dunghill top. (2. 296)

¹ The gier-eagle (see p. 397, n. 2) and nighthawk, which, an old name for the shy nightjar, is described as a contemptible bird of prey (*Prince Hohenstiel-Schwangan*, 1423).

The dabchick or little grebe is, like all its tribe, lobe-footed, spending much of its time diving for its food.

Obviously Browning had scanty information about the gannet, the famous pelagic bird which leaves the sea only to build and to rear its single nestling on remote rocky islands. In *Paracelsus* Festus speaks of the 'tranquil pleasures' of the child, Aureole (namesake of Paracelsus):

And Aureole's glee when some stray gannet builds
Amid the birch-trees by the lake. (3. 11)

This plain error was noticed during the poet's lifetime.¹

The greater number of the foregoing errors, it may be observed, are concerned with water birds, and of course the collected passages tend to give a false impression unless it is realized how few and scattered they are. But certainly Browning's knowledge and his interest lay chiefly in the passerine birds, for almost invariably his observations of these are unerring.

¹ The lapse, first noticed by R. O. Cunningham (*Ibis*, N.S. ii (1866), 15), 'surpasses the licence ordinarily taken on any subject, save natural history, by poets' (Newton, *op. cit.*, p. 300, n. 1).

Cf. the mountain vineyards which 'the lapwings love to glean among at grape-time' (*Sordello*, 1. 388)—strange food for this insectivorous plover of field and shore.

NOTES

THE AUCHINLECK LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE

THE unique text of *The Life of Adam and Eve* preserved in the Auchinleck Manuscript (National Library of Scotland, Advocates' 19.2.1) is unfortunately fragmentary. The text originally began on the third folio of the third gathering and extended to the recto of the first folio of the fourth gathering, now f. 16. The third folio of the third gathering is now missing from the manuscript, presumably excised for the sake of the initial illumination; its conjugate, the sixth folio of the same gathering, is also missing. The centre sheet of the gathering is also absent from the manuscripts, but it was recovered by Laing, and now forms ff. 1 and 2 of University of Edinburgh MS. 218. The poem therefore lacks an indeterminate number of lines at the beginning¹ and 176 lines, the contents of a single folio, in the middle. The fragments have been twice printed, by Laing in *A Penni Worth of Witte* (Abbotsford Club, 1857), pp. 49-64, and by Horstmann in *Altenglische Legende* (Heilbronn, 1878), pp. 138-47; Horstmann's text of the first fragment is taken from Laing without reference to the manuscript, and has no independent value. There is a collation by Kölbing in *Englische Studien*, vii (1884), 180-1.

The University of Edinburgh fragment is in bad condition: when Laing recovered it, it had been used as the cover of a notebook, and, as might be expected, it is badly rubbed and in places illegible. The printed texts contain many lacunae, and a number of the printed forms differ strikingly from the usual forms of the scribe; not all the errors are corrected in Kölbing's collation. Through the kindness of Professor Angus McIntosh and the authorities of the University of Edinburgh I have been able to obtain ultra-violet photographs of the fragment, in which it is possible to read all but a very few letters of the text. A collation of the photographs with the printed texts reveals that, besides the lacunae and mis-spellings already mentioned, there are a number of astonishing misreadings: so, for instance, *þe feirest of alle* appears as *þe fende gat alle*; and this misreading is not noticed by Kölbing. It therefore seems worth while to provide a new collation of Horstmann's text of the fragment, lines 1-352 of *The Life of*

¹ The number of lines missing at the beginning must be less than 176, the contents of a single folio. The preceding article, *The King of Tars*, is incomplete; but since the conclusion in the Auchinleck MS. differs from that in the other two MSS., the Vernon MS. (Bodleian 3938) and B.M. MS. Addit. 22283, the number of lines missing from it is also indeterminate.

Adam and Eve. Horstmann's text is given first, then the manuscript reading; the symbol *K* indicates that the correction is also made by Kölbing. 5 so mot yt be] so mot y the *K*. The use of *th* instead of *þ* is quite exceptional in this scribe's work, but the MS. is clear.

11 wreþþest] *sic*. The form is exceptional, since this scribe usually represents *þþ* by *tþ*: cf. *wreþed* 184, *wreþe* 424, *wreþe* noun 608.

14 þurch] þurth. So in 43, 55, 68, 69, 101, 102, 218, 319. On the form *þurth* see *Speculum*, xxvi (1951), 658, n. 5.
word] hert *K*.

17 in my see] in mi: see. (Here and elsewhere the symbol: represents an illegible letter or a space equivalent to one letter.) The form *my* is never used by the scribe; *mi*: probably stands for *min*, which is frequent even before consonants.

18 master] maister.

19-20 And anon riȝt wiþ þat . . . / He sett him in his owen . . .] & anon riȝt wiþ þat / He sett himiȝiowē: sat. In 20 the last word *sat* is very faint, and the preceding words seem to be written over an erasure. There is no sign of an erasure at the end of l. 19, and no evidence that the line is incomplete, except that the dot usually written at the end of each line is missing, as it is from l. 20. Although l. 19 is short, there are many other lines as short: e.g. 33, & *liȝtbern anon riȝt*. Line 20 may perhaps have read originally *In his owen see he sat*, or something of the kind; the scribe erased the line and rewrote it, crowding and abbreviating his words, and was then unable to find a suitable rhyme.

21 hade] *sic*. The usual forms are *had* and *hadde*, but variations between double and single consonants are not infrequent; cf. *lickenese* 75, *brenand* 129, *pennaunce* 194, *dedde* 263, *errand* (printed *eirand*) 352.

27 No paragraph in MS.

29 þer he . . .] þer he won schold. Kölbing reads *won wold*. For *won* see 306 and 335. The usual form is *schuld*, but *schold* is not infrequent in rhyme and even elsewhere; cf. 73, where Horstmann prints *schuld*.

30 men] man *K*. 39 wer] were *K*. 42 sitten] setten.

49 lectrure] lettrure *K*. The scribe nowhere uses the group *ct*.

51 in his se] in his:: se. The original reading seems to have been *in godes se*; traces are left of the tail of *g-* and of *-es*.

53 witnesse] wittnesse *K*. 54 waxep] wexep *K*.

58 Naiþer] Noiþer *K*. This curious form is invariable in this scribe's work.

60 angels] angel *K*. 69 entisement] enticement. Cf. 102, 275.

71 mat] mot *K*. 73 schuld] schold *K*.

74 frouit] *sic*. This curious form of the word 'fruit' is highly significant. OF. *ū* is regularly represented by *ou* in this scribe's work: cf. *auentour* 158, 228, *creatur* 'creature' 421. The obvious explanation of this peculiarity is that the words in question are derived from a north Norman dialect in which VL. *u* had not been

fronted or had not been fully fronted; in fact, rhymes between VL. *u* and VL. *o* are frequent in AN. texts. This explanation, however, will not suffice for *frou*, since in this word AN. *û* comes from OF. *ûi*; in the north Norman dialects without fronting *frûit* appears as *fruit*, the source of ME. *froit*.¹ It follows, therefore, that in some dialect of ME., quite apart from peculiarities of the Norman dialects, AN. *û* of any origin was regularly replaced by *ou* [u:]; it is a question of sound-substitution, of the same kind as that whereby AN. *û* is replaced in other dialects by [iu].

75 licknesse] likeness K. an adder] anadder K. The word-division is important, since the word *nadder* appears nowhere else without *n*-.

81 þe fende gat alle] þe feirest of alle.

85-88 As god, þat sitt in . . . / And witten alle his . . . / . . . 3e no schuld nouȝt se no here / Which godes . . . ere] As god þat sitt in trinite / & witen alle his priuete / : . . . 3e no schuld nouȝt se no here / Whiche godes priuetes were. So Kölbing in essentials. All the missing words are clear in the MS. except at the beginning of 87, where no trace of any letters remains except part of a vertical stroke in the initial. There is room for four letters or for three letters and a space, and the most probable word to fill the gap is *þei* 'though'.

90 Ite] It K. hede] hed.

91 No paragraph in MS.

92 him] hom K.

99 it forbede] it þe for bede K.

111 afliȝt] *sic*. O.E.D. s.v. *Afflict*, quoting examples only from 1393, suggests that the form *affliȝt* is purely scribal, and refers to *delight* < *delit*. Such an explanation is out of the question at the date of the Auchinleck MS. (c. 1330), and we must rather look to an unrecorded OE. **afliht* < *afflictus*; cf. *dihtan* < *dictare*.

126 of him] oȝain.

128 to hem] adoun. Kölbing reads *of hem*.

130 miduerd] midnerd. The scribe's distinction between *n* and *u* is never certain, but *miduerd* is an impossible form; *midnerd* is from OE. *middangeard*, *middaneard*; in *The Life of St. Margaret* 119 the same scribe uses the later form *midlerd*.

135 wepen] wopen K. Both forms are used by the scribe; cf. 649, 652, 655.

141, 143 lȝe] loghe K. Horstmann's *loȝe* could only represent OE. *lōh* 'place'; but the normal form in the scribe's orthography would be **louȝ*, cf. *louȝ* < *hlōh*. The MS. *loghe* is for *loge*, *logge*; cf. *damaghed* 696 'damaged'. The meaning 'lodge' is required by the context.

144 þe[r]in] þe in.

155 beseke] biseke K.

157 wer] were K.

162 why] whi.

186 Hongend] Hongand. The regular ending of the present participle is *-and*.

188 whe] *sic*. So also in 192 and 620: presumably an inverted spelling indicating that *wh-* had become *w-*.

¹ Luick's explanation of this form (*Historische Grammatik*, § 417. 3) is insufficient and misleading.

- 190 perfore] per for K. 191, 199, 207. New paragraphs in MS.
- 209 Tiges] tiger. So also in 235. Presumably *Tiger* represents OF. *Tigre*; *Tiges* would be difficult to explain.
- 216 also] mo K. 217 days] dayes K. 230 sustenance] sustenance K.
- 231 New paragraph in MS.
- 239 No paragraph in MS. 240 miche wo] mche wo.
- 252 dost] dest K. Both forms are used by the scribe: cf. *dest* 95, *dost* 423.
- 254 as so] al so. The upper serif of the *l* is slightly misplaced, so that the result somewhat resembles a long *s*.
- 261 com] cam. 266 penance] penaunce K.
- 282 qwoke] *sic*. The use of *qw* is exceptional, though the scribe's methods of representing consonant + *w* tend to be eccentric: *dwo* is always *du* (*duelled* 343), *tw* always *tv* (*tvay* 57, 501, *twaye* 405, *twenti* 241, 552, *twie* 272).
- 283 wold] nold.
- 289 inwest] :nwest or :uwest. Hortsmann's *invest* 'enviest' is a possible though not a probable form; Kölbing's reading *suwest* 'followest' is very plausible. There seems to have been an erasure under the *uw*.
- 291-2 And we [did] þe neuer no dede / . . . stede] & we þe neuer no dede / Harm no schame in no stede. The page is very badly rubbed, and *sc* in *schame* is extremely faint, but there is little doubt of the reading.
- 293 No paragraph in MS.
- 299 And (y) seyð] & y seyð K. 300 wer] were K.
- 307 consent] asent. The *a* is slightly smudged but cannot possibly be read as *g*, the abbreviation for *con-*. For *asent* in a similar context, cf. 363.
- 308 hen] ben K.
- 309 Euer to liue [in pine] and wo] Euer to liue in so:w: & wo. Although the *w* is smudged there can be little doubt that *so:w:* stands for *sorwe*. Kölbing's *tene* is out of the question.
- 314 envie] en vie. The word-division is important, since the scribe never uses *v* to represent medial [v].
- 320 hir] her K. 332 were] wer K.
- 340 pesternesse till] pesternisse til K.
- 342 holy hede] holy bede K.
- 352 eirand] errand K. The scribe's usual spelling is *erand*: cf. 634 and 669.

A. J. BLISS

HISTORICAL ALLUSIONS IN *ABSALOM AND ACHITOPHEL*

PROFESSOR Kinsley's note, 'Historical Allusions in *Absalom and Achitophel*', is of very great interest.¹ Although I find much of it questionable, the note, by probing Dryden's intentions, should increase appreciation of the poem. My main object in the present note is to set out why I cannot accept most of Mr. Kinsley's interpretations.

(1) Amnon's murder. The identification of this with the attack on Sir John Coventry, as set out by Mr. Kinsley, seems to me thoroughly convincing.

(2) Balaam and Caleb. In my article² I was wrong about Huntingdon's royal descent; as Mr. Kinsley shows, his descent from George, duke of Clarence, was common knowledge in Dryden's time. I should also modify my identification of Caleb as Essex: if an individual is intended by Caleb, then Essex has a better claim than anyone else.

Mr. Kinsley's arguments in favour of the old identification of Balaam as Huntingdon³ are ingenious, but not convincing. Huntingdon's conversion to the Tory party came late in the day to be commemorated in *Absalom*; if it was to be commemorated, or even alluded to, it seems to me that something more obvious was required than such implications in the name Balaam as Mr. Kinsley suggests. Further, while Balaam and Huntingdon might both be regarded as converts, they do not fit at any other point.

No one appears ever to have found in the Biblical Caleb a parallel to any of the Exclusion peers; Caleb is a good Hebrew name, and is used without reference to the son of Jephunneh. Balaam was called on by Balak to curse Israel; despite his wish to please Balak, he, as a result of God's intervention, blessed Israel. The only possible parallel seems to be with Sunderland, who, however, is inadmissible on both political and personal grounds. But if no adequate parallel can be adduced, Balaam must be regarded as merely a good name like Caleb.⁴ If any identification is to be found it must turn on the epithet 'well-hung'.

For this Mr. Kinsley gives two meanings, fluent and having large genitals. It has a third meaning, having large ears: so James Howell and Torriano give as equivalents in their dictionaries 'oreillé'⁵ and 'orecchiuto';⁶

¹ *R.E.S.*, n.s. vi (1955), 291-7.

² *R.E.S.*, xvii (1941), 307.

³ As it is discussed by Nesse it must date back to within less than two months from the publication of *Absalom*, and was probably circulating within a week or two of the publication.

⁴ One may note B for Balaam, C for Caleb, as part of an alphabetical muster.

⁵ Ed. 1673. He is following Cotgrave.

⁶ Ed. 1659.

and Oldham uses it with this meaning in his prose 'Character'.¹ As Nesse, *Absalons IX Worthies*, and the two contemporary Latin translations of *Absalom and Achitophel*² all interpret it in the second meaning, we may assume that Dryden also used it with that meaning. Their silence is not, however, a decisive argument against his having thought of its further possible meanings.

Very little is known about Huntingdon's personal qualities. There is nothing to show loose conduct; he had married in 1672. He seems to have been conscientious, but more distinguished by his birth and dignity than by any special ability. He does not seem to fit with any meaning of 'well-hung'.³

I take it that by 'the well-hung *Balaam* and cold *Caleb*' Dryden means little more than the rakes and the straitlaced; his readers were at liberty to apply the names where they chose.

(3) Stafford as Agag. Mr. Kinsley sets out his arguments for this identification most attractively; nevertheless I find them unsatisfactory. He has, however, indicated an unnoticed problem in the Corah passage.

Oates in his *Narrative* of the Plot named five Roman Catholic members of the English peerage as participants; of them Lord Arundell of Wardour was the most important.⁴ In his examination on 24 October 1678 he mentioned having seen letters signed by Stafford; but here again Arundell is more important than Stafford.⁵ Stafford was sent to the Tower on 25 October and remained there until his trial and execution. Proceedings against the five peers were twice broken off by dissolutions of Parliament; Charles II's reasons for the dissolutions were to protect Danby, his minister, and to stop the progress of the first Exclusion Bill. A new Parliament met for business on 21 October 1680. On 9 November a new witness, Edward Turberville, made a statement against Stafford in the House of Commons; Stafford's impeachment was ordered on the following day. He was tried by the Lords from 30 November to 7 December, and was found guilty by fifty-five against thirty-one votes. Charles intervened to substitute beheading for the usual form of execution for High Treason. The sentence was carried out on 29 December.

The Agag couplet runs:

And *Corah* might for *Agag's* murder call,
In terms as course as *Samuel* us'd to *Saul*.

¹ *Remains* (1703), p. 110.

² By W. Coward and Francis Atterbury (with an assistant); both 1682.

³ The Biblical *Balaam* could be regarded as fluent.

⁴ *Narrative* (1679), p. 58.

⁵ *The Discovery of the Popish Plot* (1679), p. 44; see also Historical MSS. Commission, *Ormonde MSS.*, new ser., iv. 222.

There are three words in this for discussion, 'call', 'Agag', and 'murder'.

If it had not been for Oates Stafford would never have been accused; and in the trial Oates was one of the three principal witnesses against Stafford. But Oates had not singled out Stafford in any sense—Stafford was only one of five peers; and he had no part, so far as is known, in bringing on the trial in 1680; that was due to Turberville's statement. Further, had Oates been the best witness against Stafford, Stafford would almost certainly have been acquitted; there would perhaps have been no trial.

If Oates scarcely called for his murder, Stafford is very unlike Agag. So far from coming 'unto him delicately' (1 Samuel xv. 32), Stafford counter-attacked most effectively, pointing out that by his own statements Oates had proved himself a perjurer. He convinced Evelyn that Oates's testimony 'should not be taken against the life of a Dog'.

Stafford was innocent, but it is an abuse of language to call his conviction a murder on the part of the tribunal. Analysis of the voting in the trial indicates that twenty-four of the fifty-five peers who voted for his conviction were moved, apart from their general anti-Romanist bias, solely by the evidence and speeches in the course of the trial; had Stafford succeeded in countering Dugdale's and Turberville's evidence, as he countered that of Oates, some of them would surely have voted for his acquittal. Even the king appears to have believed that Stafford may have been guilty.¹ He was the victim of successful perjury.²

Even if Dryden thought the trial tantamount to murder, he would not have dared to call it by that name in 1681; had he done so he would almost certainly have laid himself open to a serious penalty. Nor, I think, did the seventeenth century regard the witnesses as murderers: Oates was tried not for murder but for perjury; while the effects of his crimes were widely recognized, the law would not permit a charge of murder.

Mr. Kinsley raises the question of Oates's insult to the king; if Stafford cannot be accepted as Agag, it must still be explained. It belongs to a richly allusive passage.

¹ So Barillon, writing on 21 Nov./1 Dec., before the trial began: in Sir J. Pollock, *The Popish Plot* (1903), p. 368.

² For the trial I have used the report published in 1681. Among contemporary narrative accounts of it the best, in spite of some errors, is Evelyn's. I have discussed the peers' votes in an article in *Institute of Historical Research Bulletin*, xx (1947), 30-31.

There are some basic difficulties in the study of the Popish Plot trials. The reliability of the published reports has been questioned and has never been properly assessed. In any case the original editions should be used, and not the reprints in the various collections of state trials; the latter, useful as they are, contain some alterations and misprints.

There is no good life of Oates. He had little political standing at any time, and after Sir George Wakeman's trial (18 July 1679) the judges would have scrutinized his evidence very carefully.

ll. 664-7: 'Let Israels foes', &c. The four lines apparently allude to the trial, on 25 November 1679, of Thomas Knox and John Lane for conspiring 'to Defame and Scandalize' Oates and Bedloe.

l. 670: 'Should whet my memory'. This may be a reminiscence of Oates's conduct at Sir George Wakeman's trial. Oates at his examination before the Council on 30 September 1678 had denied knowing anything about Wakeman personally; at the trial he remembered a good deal about him.¹

l. 671: the most notorious 'Appendix' of the plot was Oates's accusation of Queen Catherine on 25 and 29 November 1678. But Dryden is probably thinking in more general terms.

ll. 672-3: when Knox and Lane were tried the court refused to hear a deposition which was produced, on the ground of its scandalous reflection on the king.² It is clearly a deposition by William Osborne and Lane which Oates printed shortly after the trial in his account of Knox and Lane's conspiracy. It is foul and disgusted at least one contemporary.³

(4) Issachar. Fascinating as is Mr. Kinsley's identification of the two burdens, there are strong literary and historical objections to it.

The impact of 'Issachar is a strong ass' as abuse is weakened when the ass becomes a beast of burden. In the passage in *The Spanish Fryar* in which Issachar is named the approach is different from that in *Absalom*: Gomez, wishing to speak forcefully about the burdens that laymen have to bear, calls himself an ass in doing so. But, even if we allow that Dryden, having called Thynne stupid, had a further allusion for the reader's delight, the two burdens proposed by Mr. Kinsley are unsatisfactory.

The first, entertaining Monmouth, was a fairly good political speculation: if Monmouth attained power, Thynne would be highly favoured. In any case Thynne seems to have been a personal friend of Monmouth's, and entertaining him would scarcely be a heavy tax on a very rich man.

The second, Thynne's marriage with Lady Ogle, comes very late for it to have influenced the choice of name; it took place probably in September or later, but did not become public until 7 or 9 November. It was at first sight

¹ *The Tryals of Sir George Wakeman, &c.* (1679), pp. 25-31, 53-56.

² *The Tryal . . . of Thomas Knox, &c.* (1670), p. 52.

³ *An Exact and Faithful Narrative, &c.* (1680, published 1679), p. 8; Charles Hatton, letter dated 11 Dec. 1679 (in which he indicates it precisely), in *Correspondence of the family of Hatton* (Camden Soc., 1878), i. 211. Nesse apparently identifies Agag with James, duke of York:

Where did he [Corah] with affronts the King annoy,
Or threaten him *his Brother* to Destroy?
As *Samuel* did *Saul* for *Agags* Death. . . .

—*A Key*, p. 34; 'his Brother' is identified in the margin as Agag. The identification is I think inadmissible.

I think that Scroggs is still the likeliest candidate for Agag; but, as I indicated, the parallel is not between the two men, but between Samuel's appeal to Saul for the blood of the one, and Oates's to Charles II for that of the other.

a brilliant achievement on Thynne's part. Lady Ogle was the daughter of Jocelyn Percy, eleventh earl of Northumberland, and the wealthiest heiress in England, inheriting Northumberland House in the Strand, Sion House, Petworth, and five castles in the north.¹ Her income, according to report, was indeed restricted until she came of age; as it was fixed at £4,000 per annum until then she was still a good match.² If £20,000 had to be raised to pay for her jointure from her first marriage, the sum was not likely to embarrass Thynne; in return she was entitled to £2,000 a year for life, a fair prospect for a girl of about fourteen years old.

The trouble with the marriage lay elsewhere. Lady Ogle escaped from Thynne on 9 November³ and declared that she had been betrayed into it. Legal proceedings had started by January; but on 12 February, before they had gone far, Thynne was murdered. Dryden could have foreseen none of this when he was writing the poem.

E. S. DE BEER

Professor Kinsley writes:

I am indebted to Mr. de Beer for his critical discussion of my notes. Some of his strictures require comment.

(i) Balaam. (a) If Mr. de Beer and I are justified in giving any weight to the 'characters' in *Absalons IX Worthies*, Caleb and Balaam are to be identified, like the other *personae* in *Absalom and Achitophel*, as individuals and not as types. Difficulties in identification do not warrant the assumption that Dryden has here departed from his general satiric practice. (b) There is admittedly no evidence that Huntingdon was 'well hung' (or that he was not); on the other hand, the description in *Absalons IX Worthies* of 'Priapus-Balaam' who is 'sprouted of Royal Stem' and 'his own Nest bewrayes' supports an almost contemporary identification not lightly to be set aside. (c) Huntingdon's 'conversion' was not *too* late for notice in a single couplet in *Absalom and Achitophel*; indeed, its very recentness favours my interpretation. (d) In an age of intensive Bible-reading, the test of good literary allusion to Scripture is not obviousness but subtlety.

(ii) Agag. (a) I have not suggested that the dissolution of two Parliaments of 1679 was prompted by the plight of the Catholic peers; but it did interrupt proceedings against them. (b) I have elaborated the resemblances (to which Mr. de Beer pays little heed) between Agag and Stafford, the most conspicuous and pathetic of the Catholic peers; but otherwise I have claimed little more than that (in Mr. de Beer's words) 'if it had not been for Oates Stafford would never have been accused; and in the trial Oates was

¹ *The Present State of England. Part III and Part IV* (1683), (i). 235.

² Historical MSS. Commission, *Rutland MSS.*, ii. 58.

³ This date is preferable to 7 Nov., the date given in Henry Sidney's *Diary*. The authorities for the marriage are cited in my edition of Evelyn's *Diary*, iv. 260, n. 4.

one of the three principal witnesses against Stafford'. In one sense, Stafford was 'singled out' not by Oates but by Dryden (and Evelyn and others) as the pre-eminent victim. (Cf. Dryden's account of him in 1686/8, in the pindaric ode on the marriage of Anastasia Stafford.) (c) Mr. de Beer's discussion of Stafford's 'murder' is hardly more than a quibble in this context: thirty-one peers thought him innocent; and it is doubtful whether Dryden was incurring a risk in subscribing to such a view at the end of 1681. (d) To my mind, the significant point is not that as Samuel called for Agag's blood Oates called for Stafford's (or Scroggs's, or the blood of many another), but that the deaths of Agag and Stafford are parallel in *tone*. Stafford 'counter-attacked most effectively' during the trial; but towards the end he 'spake very little, & onely Gave their Lordships thanks . . . & indeede behav'd himselfe modestly, and as became him' (Evelyn). So Agag came quietly and 'delicately' (i.e. in frailty), saying 'surely the bitterness of death is past'. (e) Mr. de Beer's annotation of ll. 664-73 is suggestive; but Oates's misdemeanours were sufficiently frequent and varied for merely general reference here.

(iii) Issachar. (a) It appears that Mr. de Beer's only 'strong literary objection' to my interpretation is that the impact of the satire is weakened by extending the parallel to include the two burdens; I have, on the contrary, suggested that the allusion is much richer than editors have supposed. The reference to Issachar in *The Spanish Fryar* is admittedly different in intention; my point is only that a year before he began work on *Absalom and Achitophel* Dryden had used Issachar to typify a man *burdened* with a wife. (b) Entertaining Monmouth may have seemed a sound political speculation to Thynne; we must not suppose that Dryden saw it, and treated it, from the same point of view. (c) The cost of marrying Lady Ogle may not in fact have been 'likely to embarrass Thynne'. But the gossip of the town was concerned with 'bonds for vast summes of mony'; Thynne's discomfort was *said* to be in part financial, and the whole situation was socially awkward and potential material for satire. News of the marriage came out very shortly before *Absalom and Achitophel* appeared. Thynne may already have been given his niche; but the comically appropriate 'Issachar' may well have replaced an earlier pseudonym while the poem was passing through the press.

REVIEWS

English Historical Documents. Volume I (c. 500-1042). Edited by DOROTHY WHITELOCK (General Editor: DAVID C. DOUGLAS). Pp. xxiv+867. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955. 80s. net.

The first volume of this ambitious series is actually the second to be published and, like the other volume, sets a very high standard for the rest of the series. In some directions the difficulties which face the editor of this volume are greater than those facing any of the other editors, for the period covered is nearly four times as long as that covered by any other volume. And although of course the choice of texts is more restricted, yet there is still a mass of material from which choice has to be made, and much of this material—codes of laws, wills, charters, obscure poems—is intractable and difficult to handle. Later accretions, forged charters, corrupt texts, all set problems which are invariably very difficult to solve. We are therefore fortunate in having as editor Dr. Whitelock, who is not only a historian but also a philologist, and who has already had much experience in dealing with most of the special difficulties that the period presents.

From the point of view of the young scholar this volume is of special importance, for it brings together material from a variety of sources which the average student of the pre-Conquest period is usually not in a position to discover for himself or use when he has discovered it. And in fact a considerable number of more experienced workers in this period have only a very hazy knowledge, if any, of Old English and Norse, and certainly not enough to cope with some of the more difficult parts of the Chronicle or a poem such as *The Seafarer*. It is true that many translations do exist, but some of them are very far from dependable. There are one or two good modern ones, and some of the modern translations of the Laws and Charters are of course beyond criticism. Mr. Garmonsway's new and excellent translation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is, unlike most of the other translations just referred to, easily available. But it is good to have Dr. Whitelock's translation too, particularly because it is so set out that it shows clearly the make-up and build of the various versions, and so helps one to distinguish the 'central kernel of the record from later and local accretions'.

The translations from Latin sources are equally important. There are teachers of the old school who think it proper that a young student should be prepared to tackle a Latin document without help. But the modern teacher knows that it is useless to expect any young student to tackle a difficult piece of medieval Latin. It is very questionable whether a student in the old days who had been all through the discipline of a classical education was very much better fitted to tackle a piece of Bede or Eddius or Aldhelm. Medieval Latin has difficulties of its own which it requires a specialist to face. Not all of the texts which one wishes a student to know of have been translated before, and many of the nineteenth-century translations, which are the only ones available, leave much to be desired.

Several examples of the difficulties referred to may be seen in Dr. Whitelock's translation of Bede's *Letter to Archbishop Egbert*. She bases her translation on that of Giles but does not mention that of Joseph Stevenson (*Church Historians of England* (1853), i. pt. ii, 653 ff.). On the whole Stevenson is to be preferred to Giles. His translation, though by no means accurate, avoids some of the pitfalls into which Giles falls, such as translating *Rex virtutum* as 'King of virtues' (cf. p. 737). *Virtus* in Bede must never be translated 'virtue'. It means 'might' or 'miraculous powers'. Again, *sperat* should not be translated 'hopeth' (cf. p. 736, l. 17), but 'thinks' as Stevenson, or better still, 'expects'. In the passage on p. 736, l. 23, both Giles and Stevenson (and Dr. Whitelock) miss the point. It should read 'to occupy your tongue and mind, the one with the divine words, the other with meditations upon the scriptures'. It is an interesting allusion to the fact that in the Middle Ages, up to the time of the printed book, to read silently to oneself was looked upon as an eccentricity. St. Augustine in his *Confessions* refers at length to the curious habit of St. Ambrose of reading the Scriptures silently (Bk. vi, c. 3). There are a number of other examples of the same inexactitudes in this piece where Dr. Whitelock has followed Giles.

Again in her selections from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* Dr. Whitelock bases her translation on the Giles-Stevens version. This is the best known of them all, for it was published both in Bohn's Antiquarian Library and also in Everyman's Library (though Dr. Whitelock attributes the latter to L. C. Jane).¹ A number of other translations have appeared, none of which is very good, and even the latest translation in the Penguin Series is not so much a translation as a paraphrase which is often most misleading. Dr. Whitelock corrects some obvious inaccuracies and prunes the style; but the resulting translation is not outstandingly better than others, which are easily available. It may well be asked whether Dr. Whitelock was justified in devoting a hundred pages of her most valuable book to it. There is of course everything to be said for having what is after all one of the chief sources of Anglo-Saxon history within the same covers as the rest. The ideal thing would have been for the editor to have taken her courage in both hands and to have produced an entirely new and worthy translation. It would have added considerably to her labours but it would have made us feel less jealous of the valuable space now occupied by a not very satisfactory translation.

For there are many things she might have done with these hundred pages. Dr. Whitelock undoubtedly had to make some heart-breaking decisions. Would she not have liked to put in some of those texts which throw light on the everyday life and thought of the Anglo-Saxon people such as some of the Riddles, or the Charms and Remedies, or Ælfric's Colloquy, or even some extracts from the Penitentials? And another lack which many will regret is a subject index. This was presumably also crowded out, but though it would have entailed much labour it would have been a great boon and would have saved much time for the less advanced student.

¹ The Everyman edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* is based on the translation of Stevens (1723) revised by J. A. Giles (1847), with notes by L. C. Jane (1903). The attribution in the current edition is a mistaken one and has led several scholars astray. It is to be corrected by the publishers as soon as possible.

Those who are familiar with Dr. Whitelock's writings will not be surprised to find that her introductions are models of their kind—scholarly, up to date, concise, and most readable. The introduction, which deals with the various versions of the Chronicle (pp. 109 ff.), is particularly valuable and important. In it she expresses her conviction that the archetype from which versions D and E of the Chronicle were copied was written at York, a thesis which she has very recently propounded more fully in her Preface to the facsimile of the Peterborough Chronicle in the Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile series (which must now be added to her own bibliography on p. 129). Together these introductions form a most important contribution to Anglo-Saxon studies. The whole book is an outstanding piece of work, and will undoubtedly long remain the standard source-book for all students of Anglo-Saxon history. The casual reader will also find much in its pages to enjoy. In spite of its expense it is certainly a book which will be so constantly needed that all serious scholars of the period will feel it essential to have a copy of their own. Dr. Whitelock deserves our thanks and congratulations on a great achievement.

BERTRAM COLGRAVE

The English Church in the Fourteenth Century. Based on the Birkbeck Lectures, 1948. By W. A. PANTIN. Pp. xii+292. Cambridge: University Press, 1955. 25s. net.

Mr. Pantin does not try to provide an all-embracing account of ecclesiastical organization and activity such as, in their different ways, Dr. J. R. H. Moorman's for the thirteenth century or the late Professor A. Hamilton Thompson's for the clergy in the later Middle Ages. He concentrates rather on some of the more distinctive developments in his selected field, under the heads of 'Church and State', 'Intellectual life and controversy', and 'Religious literature', though touching incidentally and illuminatingly on many other topics of interest.

Of the three parts of the volume the second especially summarizes the author's original work, previously published in scattered places over many years, together with the cognate contributions of other scholars. Although the other two parts are to a much smaller extent his own, they are based on the best recent research, obviously confirmed and supplemented at first hand, and show the same shrewd and sympathetic judgement. The third part, which chiefly concerns us here (though the appreciation of vernacular literature is by no means confined to it—one may instance the account of Franciscan sermon-verse on pp. 141-2), constitutes a relatively novel and most salutary recognition, for a professional, that 'these works are of vital interest to the ecclesiastical historian and the historian of theology': which, perhaps it still needs to be added, implies, from this author, the degree of their general importance. He supports his contention by perceptive comments on a considerable number of compositions, seen as examples of an estimable endeavour of religious thought and education and not, as so often hitherto, merely sources to be pillaged for references to external events, notions, and customs. Literary historians have almost as much to learn as others from Mr. Pantin's procedure in this respect.

His discussion of theological writings in Latin, French, and English is probably, so far as it goes (and he very rightly includes certain works of other centuries, such as St. Edmund Rich's *Mirror* and the *Book* of Margery Kempe), the most sound and systematic in print, though not of course exhaustive. The three categories with which he deals are the manuals of instruction for parish priests, religious and moral treatises in the vernacular, and English mystical literature. Of these groups the first two are very closely allied in content and purpose, even more than he demonstrates, while the third is sometimes (in the most interesting and successful works like St. Edmund's or Duke Henry's) combined with, and always dependent on, the other kinds: 'Indeed, the marked taste for mystical literature among the more devout laity of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries presupposes a thorough grounding in dogmatic and moral instruction, through the pulpit and confessional as well as through reading.' He thus emphasizes repeatedly (most satisfactorily in his excellent final paragraph) what may be called the rise of the educated layman, illustrating also, but not perhaps sufficiently insisting on, the at least equally influential feminine factor; and it is therefore somewhat surprising that he should neglect one type of literature, connected in function with the things he treats—namely the body of scriptural translations, paraphrases, expositions, and meditations, which seem in practice primarily to have served devotional purposes, whatever their origins. No doubt it seemed unnecessary and inconsistent with the author's deliberate selection of lesser-known personalities and pieces for the short sketches which form a good proportion of his pages. It might be thought that he attempts to mention too many minor items in this last portion of the book, and that he would have done well to confine himself to fewer cases, but additional awareness of the context appears through the briefest references, as in those to otherwise omitted major writers (e.g. Chaucer, Langland, and Gower, pp. 226–7). One may note among other virtues his grasp of the competitive character of vernacular didactic verse (pp. 221–2) and of the quality of the more elaborate moral treatises (p. 229).

There are some signs of lack of revision: on p. 111 the spelling *Ancren Riewle*; on p. 178 Uthred for Easton; on p. 195, twice, Henry for Simon of Ghent; on p. 214 Lilleshall styled priory instead of abbey; while the *Speculum Vitae* is not as such entered in the index. On points of fact one may comment that the *Pupilla Oculi* did, on the evidence of wills, supersede the *Oculus Sacerdotis* in the fifteenth century; that there is more than one English version of St. Edmund's *Mirror*, and not only four known manuscripts of *Handlyng Synne*, quite apart from Idley's version of it, which is not mentioned; while *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight* might have been cited, as well as Rolle, as significantly contemporaneous with Duke Henry.

If the book as a whole, and particularly the last part, may seem slightly disappointing to those for whom its matter is not wholly new, this is not a little due to Mr. Pantin's deceptive modesty, which should not lead us to underestimate either his potential effect or actual achievement.

A. I. DOYLE

Shakespeare. Spokesman of the Third Estate. By LORENTZ ECKHOFF. Pp. xiv+201 (Oslo Studies in English 3). Oslo: Akademisk forlag; Oxford: Blackwell, 1954. Kr. 15; 15s. net.

The English edition of Professor Eckhoff's book (translated by R. I. Christophersen) is presented to the author on his seventieth birthday by nearly three hundred colleagues, students, and friends in recognition of 'his lifelong and devoted service to the study and teaching of Literature'. The Norwegian edition of the book was published in 1938, but the present edition contains some alterations.

Dr. Eckhoff maintains that Shakespearean research ignores the central problem, that 'of Shakespeare himself, his personality, his reaction to life and men, his ideas, his philosophy', and he believes that it is the duty of a critic to find in the plays Shakespeare's philosophy of life. By an examination of such plays as *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, and *Troilus and Cressida*, Dr. Eckhoff comes to the conclusion that 'there is a strong strain of pessimism' in Shakespeare's attitude. By analysing these and other plays, he then tries to show that the poet believed that people were brought to their ruin because they were governed by their passions. In the Histories and in several other plays Shakespeare was warning us of the dangers of power; and in *As You Like It* and *The Tempest* he writes of the healing power of Nature. Dr. Eckhoff then deals briefly with some comic characters—Rosalind, Beatrice, Falstaff—and tries to reconcile Shakespeare's generally pessimistic outlook with the gaiety and zest for life manifested in the comedies by suggesting that

he is a pessimist in big things, an optimist in small things; a pessimist if you ask him whether he approves of the management of this world,—an optimist when looking at the healing forces of nature, or at certain individuals.

Finally, Dr. Eckhoff explains his sub-title, 'Spokesman of the Third Estate', by arguing that Shakespeare was opposed to the aristocratic view of life. In play after play he expressed his dissatisfaction with the government of the world and of the state:

his scepticism with regard to love; his mistrust of passion, of boundless ambition, of unruly energy; his trust in, and approval of, the completely opposite attitude; of level-headedness, of consistency, moderation, impassivity, and balance.

Dr. Eckhoff is aware, but not always sufficiently aware, of the dangers of his method. It is inevitably subjective and selective. It is difficult to believe, for example, after reading *Romeo and Juliet* or the *Sonnets*, that Shakespeare was sceptical with regard to love. Dr. Eckhoff quotes the lines on the lunatic, the lover, and the poet, and he thinks they show that 'love is a sort of madness, an aberration of the imagination'. But even if the 'I' of the *Sonnets* cannot be wholly identified with the poet, they are more likely to express his personal views than the genial Philistine, Theseus. Then again, Dr. Eckhoff believes that Prospero's lines at the conclusion of the masque 'express something fundamental and very real in Shakespeare's attitude to life'; and he thinks that the dirge in *Cymbeline* shows that 'Shakespeare felt no pressing need for the ideas of Christi-

anity'. It may be said, however, that a pagan dirge is appropriate to a play in which Jupiter appears. What is more significant is that Shakespeare goes out of his way, a few lines before the dirge, to insert a hint of Christian belief: 'We must lay his head to th'East.'

It may be doubted whether any character can be taken as Shakespeare's particular mouthpiece; and we certainly cannot assume from the series of tragedies written between 1600 and 1608 that Shakespeare was a pessimist, any more than we could assume that he became an optimist when he wrote the Romances. The relationship between the poet and his work is more complex than Dr. Eckhoff sometimes seems to imply. The tragic form necessarily evokes tragic attitudes. Shakespeare, of course, may have been attracted to certain themes by his personal prepossessions. He may have believed that Frailty's name was woman, for example; but it is surely just as likely that the bitterness or pessimism in some of his plays was called forth by the material he dramatized. In any case, not all critics would agree with the view that the great tragedies are pessimistic. From *King Lear* one might reasonably extract the moral that the will to power is self-destructive, and from *Macbeth* the very trite one that crime doesn't pay.

It would be wrong, however, to suggest that all Dr. Eckhoff's book is vitiated by his method. He is often aware of the danger of confusing Shakespeare's views with those of his characters. He has, indeed, a spirited protest against the assumption that Ulysses is the poet's mouthpiece. His book will be valued as the personal view of a veteran scholar rather than as a book which plucks out the heart of Shakespeare's mystery.

KENNETH MUIR

King John. Edited by E. A. J. HONIGMANN. Pp. lxxvi + 176 (The Arden Shakespeare [new and revised edition]. General Editor: UNA ELLIS-FERMOR). London: Methuen, 1954. 18s. net.

What will probably arouse most interest in the Introduction to this edition is Mr. Honigmann's argument that *The Troublesome Reign* was an imitation of Shakespeare's *King John*. His evidence fails to shake my confidence in the earlier view that Shakespeare was the debtor, for there must be some documentary link between the two plays on the evidence of their stage directions. At the head of the opening scene we find, for instance:

Enter K. John, Queen Elinor his mother, William Marshal Earle of Pembroke, the Earles of Essex, and of Salisbury (T.R.)

Enter King John, Queene Elinor, Pembroke, Essex, and Salisbury, with the Chattyllion of France (K. John).

The significant feature here is the coincidence in the order in which the three earls are enumerated. Further, in *The Troublesome Reign* all are addressed by name—Essex repeatedly; but in *K. John*, Essex speaks only three lines as the anonymous introducer of the Sheriff and then disappears from the text in favour

of Bigot. How, then, could a spectator deduce from a stage performance of Shakespeare's play that Essex was present in this scene? The problem admits of no such simple solution as the appearance of Clarence in the bad quarto of *Henry V*, since 2 *Henry IV*, iv. iv must have established him in the minds of actors and playgoers as Henry's favourite brother. With the order in which the earls are enumerated in I. i, we may compare a later entry:

Enter Penbrooke, Salsburie, Essex (2 *T.R.*, i. 26)

Enter Pembroke, Salisbury, & Bigot (*K. John*, iv. iii. 10).

We have further (the italics are mine):

They summon the Towne, the Citizens appeare *upon the walls* (1 *T.R.*, ii. 191)

Trumpet sounds. Enter a Citizen *upon the walles* (*K. John*, II. i. 200);

though later we find:

Enter yong Arthur *on the walls* (2 *T.R.*, i)

Enter Arthur *on the walles* (*K. John*, iv. iii).

These suggest a documentary link which memorial reconstruction will not account for. On the evidence of these stage directions and the character of verbal correspondences in the dialogue, my conclusion many years ago was that Shakespeare wrote his play with *The Troublesome Reign* at hand and, in spite of Mr. Honigmann's arguments, I see no reason to change it. I am similarly impervious to the argument that *K. John* was a topical play, reflecting Elizabeth's repudiation of Davison in John's repudiation of Hubert and, further, that the blockade of Angiers was inspired by the Burbage-Brayne (1590) dispute over the Theatre. I should have thought that John's outburst when confronted with the evidence of his damnation (iv. ii. 215 ff.) made it sufficiently clear that Shakespeare's play was written at a time when the hand and seal of an English monarch was not a burning question. The Introduction, though it contains some useful matter, should be read throughout with caution. I have concentrated on its main thesis, but found it, on many matters, confused in argument and especially hazy and speculative on textual problems.

The text itself is not a serviceable one. Mr. Honigmann sticks as closely as he can to F's divisions and his II. ii and III. i cover what is usually reckoned as a single scene (III. i); on the other hand, he makes a single scene of III. ii-iii, though the stage is evidently clear after III. ii. 10. In II. i, reluctance to accept the general view that Shakespeare confused the Christian names of the French king and the Dauphin prompts an unsatisfactory redistribution of lines, and later in the same scene Mr. Honigmann assigns to Hubert the role of spokesman for Angiers. The text is also impaired by barbarisms like 'wive's' (= wife's). About half the emendations in the *textus receptus* are rejected for reasons which seem to me absurd. Thus F's 'cased lion' is 'one still wearing his *case* (= skin), i.e. a live lion' (III. i. 185). Mr. Honigmann is undisturbed by a current's *roaming* rather than *running* (II. i. 335) and finds it just as suitable that the 'free breath' of a king should be *tasted* as that it should be *tasked* or *taxed* (III. i. 74). The same tendency to ravel up the sense is evident in the notes. In spite of its charnel-house context,

'the couch of lasting night' (= the grave, an echo of Job xvii. 13) is explained as 'Hell, where Death is at rest since he cannot function' (III. iii. 27); and 'the watchful minutes to the hour' (IV. i. 46) is described as probably a parenthood image, 'viz. minutes = the brood or chicks of the hen-hour'. A great deal of work has clearly been put into this edition but its lack of critical sense makes it too peculiar to be of value. The editor seems more bent on making difficulties than on clearing them out of the reader's way.

ALICE WALKER

Studies in Elizabethan Drama. By PERCY SIMPSON. Pp. x+266. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. 25s. net.

This book appeared not long before its author's ninetieth birthday. Readers of *R.E.S.* will join me in congratulating him and the fellow-scholar and 'junior editor' to whom he dedicates the volume, who is scarcely less eminent in the field of Donne than he is in the field of Ben, and to whose wifely care we assuredly in large measure owe his continued health and unceasing productivity. It has been a great innings; and it is not yet over, for if he goes on batting as vigorously as he does in these *Studies* he bids fair to reach a hundred not out in 1965.

The volume consists of eight 'Studies', six of them previously printed, the other two, 'Shakespeare's Use of Latin Authors' and 'Shakespeare's Versification', being here published for the first time. As I happened to have completed on my own account a study of the former topic for *Shakespeare Survey* 1956 when Dr. Simpson's volume came to my hands, I felt it might be more interesting to all concerned to let the independent essays go out without any cross-firing and to call in a third opinion on this difficult question, that of Professor J. A. K. Thomson, whose valuable *Shakespeare and the Classics* appeared in 1951, after Dr. Simpson's essay, as he tells us, had been conceived and largely written. Professor Thomson's observations will be found at the end of this notice. The essay on 'Shakespeare's Versification', though I think containing nothing new, is a useful survey of the dramatist's metrical development, not to be found elsewhere within the same compass. The third essay, entitled 'The "Headless Bear" in Shakespeare and Burton', is mainly concerned with a contemporary newspaper pamphlet which appears to show that the monster alluded to by Puck in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* and mentioned by Burton in the third edition of *The Anatomy of Melancholy*—and by Lewis Carroll in *Sylvie and Bruno*!—has some kind of folk-lore origin. There follows an essay on 'Marlowe's "Tragical History of Doctor Faustus"' which, being a reprint from *Essays and Studies* 1929, was written twenty years before the publication of Sir Walter Greg's parallel-text edition of that play with its exhaustive introduction and voluminous notes. One cannot help regretting that Dr. Simpson 'thought it best to let it stand as it was written', since his conclusions differ in some important respects from Sir Walter's. I am not thinking of bibliographical or purely textual matters, upon which it is hazardous to question Sir Walter's opinions, but of aesthetic decisions for which with his usual candour he claims 'no more competence to pronounce than the next man'. In particular I have in mind two scenes of the last act, in

one of which Lucifer and Beelzebub join Mephistophilis, and in the other the scholars return to collect the limbs of Faustus for burial after the Devils have torn him in pieces. Neither is found in Text A (1604), and Dr. Simpson unhesitatingly assigns both to the adapter whose hand he finds at several places in Text B (1616). Sir Walter, on the other hand, regards them as scenes in Marlowe's first draft which were deleted before the play was produced on the stage. In respect of this second scene, at any rate, my opinion, for what it is worth, agrees with Dr. Simpson's. I cannot believe these shallow, sloppy, end-stopped lines could ever have come from the same rich and vigorous mind as gave us the epilogue, to say nothing of the hero's last speech. The fifth paper on 'The Art of Ben Jonson' is also a reprint from *Essays and Studies* (1944) and is of course valuable as far as it goes. Is it too much to hope, however, that it may be followed by further treatment of the same subject upon which after thirty years' work the editor must have a good deal more to tell us? The brief essay that comes next, entitled 'King Charles the First as Dramatic Critic', describes and explains the notes on *The Maid's Tragedy* written by the king in a copy of Beaumont and Fletcher once owned by Malone and now in the Bodleian. There follows a reprint of the British Academy Shakespeare Lecture for 1935, on 'The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragedy'; and finally the longest essay in the volume, 'The Official Control of Tudor and Stuart Printing'. This last, though described in the preface as 'a development of a lecture to the Oxford Bibliographical Society', seems to take little note of work on Shakespeare's text since its original publication in the Society's proceedings of 1947. In the paragraphs on pirated quartos, for example, stenography is still regarded as the probable method of transmission, without reference to Professor Duthie's *Elizabethan Shorthand* (1949), which according to Greg probably knocked the last nail into the coffin of the theory of stenography, or even to Duthie's earlier treatment of the subject in *The Bad Quarto of 'Hamlet'* (1941). There is a slip also on p. 195 where James Roberts is stated to have entered *Troilus and Cressida* on the Stationers' Register in 1602 instead of 1603.

J. DOVER WILSON

I have been invited to say something about the first (and longest but one) of the studies in Dr. Percy Simpson's book—the study entitled 'Shakespeare's Use of Latin Authors'. The invitation, so honourable to me, I gladly accept for this among other reasons that it gives me an opportunity to express my share of the admiration which all classical scholars must feel for the distinguished editor of Jonson. To them it cannot but be a matter of special interest that Dr. Simpson has now turned his attention to Shakespeare's Latin. It also gives me the opportunity of confirming what he says about the complete independence of his essay in relation to mine, which I called *Shakespeare and the Classics*. Neither of us knew, until it was too late, that the other was writing on the subject. But my contribution having had the good or bad luck to precede his in the order of publication, Dr. Simpson has been able to make some references to or comments upon it which make it not improper for me to reply, not in a controversial spirit—which would be quite out of place in a review—but from a desire to clear up the great point at issue between us.

So far as I can see—for there is much on which we are in complete agreement—the great difference between us lies in our approach to the evidence, to the question ‘What sort of “proof” are we looking for in it?’

The tradition, which goes back to Shakespeare’s contemporaries and is supported by what I should have thought an irresistible weight of authority, has it that he was, comparatively and by the standards of his time and class, deficient in classical scholarship. Therefore if anyone now denies the substantial truth of this tradition, the burden of proof is clearly on him. He must show that Jonson and the rest were wrong on a point on which they alone were competent to speak from personal knowledge. The difficulty inherent in such a task is so great, the chances of success appear so small, that the judge is bound to subject every argument which tends to overthrow the traditional view to the most rigorous examination. He must rule out what is founded on mere possibility or even plausibility. So it is not enough to maintain that something in Shakespeare was evidently suggested by something in a classical author; it must be shown without reasonable doubt that he got it by his own reading of the classical author in the original and not from some translation, or in some English book, or in conversation, or independently in his own mind. And for my own part I have always found this extraordinarily difficult.

Of course no open-minded critic can deny the existence of many, often very striking, parallels in Shakespeare to thoughts and expressions in Latin authors, though when we consider the infinite variety of Shakespeare’s mind I do not know that this should greatly surprise us. Still there they are, and each must be considered on its merits. There is no one better qualified than Dr. Simpson to do this and it is impossible to follow his guidance without pleasure and profit. That it leaves me so often unconvinced is due to the reason I have tried to explain—that it is often possible to account for the parallelism in some other way than by assuming that Shakespeare had read, in Latin, the Latin original which is taken to have inspired it.

It is of course quite impossible here to analyse every quotation. But Dr. Simpson will be the first to wish me in the interests of scholarship to touch on one or two. And I am sure he will agree that, as a first essential, the parallels must be true and not merely apparent parallels. But take this instance which he quotes (p. 23) from *Julius Caesar* (III. ii. 75–76):

The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones.

With this he compares from the *Poenulus* of Plautus

malo si quid bene facias, beneficium interit;
bono si quid male facias, aetatem expetit (635–6),

that is to say, ‘If you benefit a bad man the benefit dies; if you injure a good man the injury goes on living’. The translation shows that there is no true parallel here; the idea which Shakespeare expresses is quite different from that expressed by Plautus, who is not speaking of the dead at all. On p. 50 Dr. Simpson compares (from 3 *Henry VI*, I. ii. 16), ‘But for a kingdom any oath may be broken’

with this line from Seneca's *Phoenissae* (664): 'imperia pretio quolibet constant bene'. But the Latin means 'Sovereignty is cheap at any price'. And that is quite a different point. Again, on p. 41, Dr. Simpson quotes the passage which tells how Hamlet was sent to England 'because a' was mad' with the comment 'Twill not be seen in him there; there the folks are as mad as he' (v. i. 146 f.). With this he, perhaps following Yonge, compares two lines from Horace (*Satires*, II. iii. 120-1) where the speaker, who is arguing that nearly everybody is more or less mad, adds that in the case of a miser

nimirum insanus paucis videatur, eo quod
maxima pars hominum morbo iactatur eodem,

which means, 'To be sure not many would look on him as mad, for the reason that the vast majority of human beings labour under the same affliction'—that is madness, of which miserliness is a symptom in the eyes of a Stoic philosopher. But the point of the Gravedigger's joke—which is obviously 'topical'—is that, while the rest of the world is reasonably sane, Englishmen are an exception. And this is almost the opposite of what the speaker in Horace means.

It may be also that Dr. Simpson has occasionally been misled by what he read in authorities whom he had every reason to trust. Thus in discussing the *Comedy of Errors* he argues—as I did—on the assumption that there was no English translation of the *Amphitryo* which Shakespeare could have read. But now Dr. R. R. Bolgar (*The Classical Heritage* (1954), p. 532) says there was—a version by W. Courtney issued in 1562/3. So it is no longer possible to argue that Shakespeare must have gone to the original Latin for the *Amphitryo* elements in his comedy. In any case when Shakespeare was young the plots of the *Amphitryo* and the *Menaechmi* were being imitated on every stage in Europe, so that no working dramatist could be unfamiliar with them, whether he read Plautus in the original or not.

I suppose that the question of Shakespeare's Latin, if it can be settled at all—which I take leave to doubt—must be settled by the balance of probabilities. And who is to strike this balance? Dr. Simpson appears to think it likely that the line in *Julius Caesar*, 'That day he overcame the Nervii', was suggested by Shakespeare's reading of the *Bellum Gallicum*. But surely that is far less probable than that it was suggested by his reading of North's *Plutarch*. We do not know whether Shakespeare read the second book of the *Bellum Gallicum*, but we do know that he read with what was, for him, the closest attention the *Life of Julius Caesar*. There he found the battle with the Nervii described in a way that could easily lead the reader, as I fancy it led Shakespeare, to regard it as Caesar's 'crowning mercy' in his Gallic wars.

Dr. Simpson may justly claim that his case is not dependent on the certainty of particular instances but on the cumulative effect of them all. On the other hand the dispassionate reader is bound, if he has had any logical training at all, to be cautious in the use of this dangerous form of argumentation. For it can be employed on both sides of the question. Therefore, if he is to be fair, he must also take into account the certainly not inconsiderable list of passages which appear to support the Jonsonian verdict. Nobody perhaps would deny—at least I do not—

that Jonson was likely to demand too high a standard of scholarship from his fellow dramatists. But that is not really the point at issue. What needs to be explained is why Jonson should have regarded his friend Shakespeare as more open than others, or at least than most, to the charge of deficient skill in the ancient languages and literatures. One can of course think of various answers to this question but of none that seems in the least convincing except the obvious one, that Jonson's estimate was right. Why should we not accept it? It can make no difference to Shakespeare, unless, as Dryden thought, to 'give him the greater commendation'.

J. A. K. THOMSON

Tragicomedy: its origin and development in Italy, France and England.

By MARVIN T. HERRICK. Pp. viii+331 (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 39). Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955. \$4.

'What', asks Professor Herrick, 'has tragicomedy actually contributed to the modern drama since the Renaissance?' and he gives the answer:

Tragicomedy, whether actually so called or not, has always been the backbone of the modern drama, which has always been a compromise between classical tradition and the modern way of life, and a compromise between classical tragedy and classical comedy. . . . The term tragicomedy gave some assurance to poets who were willing, some of them even anxious, to follow classical tradition, but at the same time were compelled to satisfy the modern demand for a freer form. The term is now antiquated, for traditional labels have lost their importance, but most of the significant modern dramas still occupy a middle ground between tragedy and comedy.

The subject, therefore, is of very considerable importance and it is good to have Mr. Herrick's survey of the tragicomic concept in critical theory and theatrical practice during the early formative years. As he shows, the term 'tragicomedy' was one of diverse meanings, confused by the eternal debates of critics bound by the classical tradition and by the independent efforts of various playwrights either dealing with new material (such as appears in the *Christian Terence*) or endeavouring to capture the attention of the public by fresh means of approach. Some interpreted it in terms of the ending (happy, unhappy, mixed), some in terms of the characters (elevated, low), some in terms of subject-matter (historical for tragedy, fictional for comedy). The word, therefore, could be made to apply to a drama, (1) of elevated characters with a happy conclusion, (2) of elevated characters in which happiness was apportioned to the good, and death or severe punishment to the evil, (3) of less elevated characters involved in rather unhappy events, (4) of fictional material even if it ended semi-tragically, (5) of historical material ending happily, or (6) of double plot, one tragic and one comic. Indeed, to the confusion might be added (although Mr. Herrick does not mention it) the double sense of the word *commedia*, sometimes specifically applied to 'comedy' in the modern

signification and sometimes applied to 'drama' in general: *i commedianti*, *les comédiens* and even 'the comedians' were not necessarily purveyors of laughter only, nor was a *commedia* invariably joyous. (An example of the English 'comedy' in a general sense, which seemingly has puzzled Mr. Herrick, appears on p. 232 of his study.)

On the whole, this survey of tragicomedy gives us a clear picture of the way in which the various critical ideas and practical efforts battled with each other in the sixteenth century and gradually came to agree in establishing a new and potent form on the stage. The story starts with faint suggestions in the classical period, shifts emphasis in the *Christian Terence*, is given a sense of direction in the significant *tragedie di lieto fin* beloved by Giraldo Cinthio. Thence the tale proceeds until it reaches an accomplished conclusion in Italy with Guarini's masterpiece. Meanwhile in France different stage conditions led towards an independent movement in the same direction, and this section of the narrative serves as it were for a bridge between the examination of the Italian works and that of the more powerful English plays, inspired partly by equally independent early native effort and partly by Italian example.

Mr. Herrick has some excellent chapters, notably that on Cinthio's important dramatic endeavours. Perhaps, however, we may consider it a trifle unfortunate that he has elected, in a formal manner, to present so many detailed synopses of plots, since this procedure sometimes has the effect of impeding the main story and sometimes results in the obscuring of significant matter by an accumulation of facts not always strictly pertinent. Such procedure, indeed, goes beyond the synopses. In a work of this kind, for example, it seems useless to have such comments as:

There were several *Cleopatras*, including one by Cinthio. Bertana thinks that Orlando Pescetti' [*sic*] *Giulio Cesare* (1594) had some merit along with many faults.

Either, it would seem, Pescetti's drama has no bearing on the present theme, and accordingly mention of it is completely unnecessary; or it has a bearing—in which event it demands the personal scrutiny and evaluation of the author.

It is unfortunate, too, that practically all the quotations, both from plays and the writings of contemporary critics, are given in translation. No doubt most of the English versions come as near as translation can to reproducing the implications of the original words, but one might well have wished in a specialist study of this kind to have had the opportunity of checking, particularly since examination shows that not always is the exact sense conveyed to us in Mr. Herrick's renderings. A prime example appears in the version given here of the final short chorus of Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*:

O fortunata coppia,
Che pianto ha-seminato e riso accoglie,
Con quante amare doglie
Hai raddolciti tu gli affetti tuoi.
Quinci imparate voi,
O ciechi e troppo teneri mortali,
I sinceri dilette e i veri mali.

Non è sana ogni gioia,
 Nè mal ciò che v' annoia.
 Quello è vero gioire
 Che nasce da virtù dopo il soffrire.

These lines are particularly important because in them Guarini presents the philosophical basis of his *tragicommedia pastorale*. This philosophy in the English version is either transformed, or, at least, rendered somewhat confusing in its argument:

O happy couple that sowed tears and reaped laughter! How love has sweetened all your pains! Hence learn, O blind and over-tender mortals, honest delights and true evils. Not every joy is wholesome, nor every evil irksome. True joy springs from virtue after suffering.

Surely it is not 'How love has sweetened all your pains', but, literally, 'With how many bitter pains have you made your love sweet' or, more freely, 'How much sweeter you have made your love by the pains you have endured'; it is not 'honest delights', but 'genuine pleasures' (or perhaps 'real happiness'); it is not 'nor every evil irksome', but 'nor every irksome thing an ill'. Guarini, in fact, is addressing short-sighted men and women who think every temporary annoyance a bad thing and every immediate joy good: he is endeavouring, here and in his play, to prove that true joy and happiness arise from, or are deepened by, an amount of willingly sustained distress and pain.

In general, however, we may welcome Mr. Herrick's study as a very useful survey of its subject—how useful, in fact, is shown when he turns to scrutinize the various attempts which have been made to define the quality of the Beaumont and Fletcher plays. The familiar features of these dramas are demonstrated to be fully reflected in the long line of preceding works in which playwrights great and small sought in diverse ways to stretch out their hands towards the modern drama.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL

Anti-Puritan Satire 1572-1642. By WILLIAM P. HOLDEN. Pp. xii+165 (Yale Studies in English 126). New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. \$3.75; 30s. net.

We have long laboured under misapprehensions inherited from literary historians who knew that, without even a smattering of church history, they were perfectly familiar with the species Puritan. The deeply marked character of the Puritan could be attacked or even defended, but not mistaken. This certainty about Puritanism, however, has recently shown signs of abating. Mr. Holden's timely study will help, for here is a literary historian who has gone to some trouble to discover what the Puritans were. *Anti-Puritan Satire* embraces numerous complex subjects: the Marprelate controversy, Spenser's religious position, the Puritan character in Jacobean drama, and so on. The author cannot be expected to add to our factual knowledge of all these; at times, indeed, he seems scarcely to have mastered the intricacies of the researches he summarizes. The justification of venturing on so many distinct topics lies solely in a valuable attempt to

relate the satires to the serious controversies of the time, and to show the same arguments used in both. The book accordingly opens with a brief history of the Puritan controversies, which for its compass is the most convenient survey that we have. It arouses the expectation that we are dealing with an author who will not betray the complexity of the pattern for an easy answer. Particularly welcome is Mr. Holden's recognition (which will shock many) that in the sixteenth century there was little difference in dogmatic theology between the parties, even Hooker believing doctrines which are now often called Calvinistic. Mistakes in detail, however, abound: the general reader should be warned that the Reformers were not anti-sacerdotal; that other than extremist Protestants called the Roman Church unchristian; and that the Puritans disowned the Anabaptists more, not less, vehemently than the 'Anglicans' did—the Puritans themselves being only tardily and reluctantly separatist.

The book's chief fault as history lies in the sort of impartiality it professedly seeks:

A detached skepticism concerning both sides . . . if it eliminated some of the joy of partisanship, might supply the compensating satisfaction of examining with a disinterested eye all claims to perfection.

Do we want the violence of 1642 to become 'more understandable', if this means that 'it is less possible to deplore what happened'? Such detachment does permit honest and accurate description; but a stranger's description, from the outside. Perhaps a deeper understanding of the controversy can only come through the sympathetic and engaged imagination, avoiding partisanship by the more difficult way of charity. Such a sentence as 'the Anglican entered into the fray with a delight at least as great as that of his opponent' betrays excessive detachment (to say the least) from the tragedy of the church's division. There is no reminder that religious differences were occasionally discussed with courtesy, nor that the motives activating at least some of the polemicists were different from the motives of the satirists.

Turning to the criticism of the satire itself, we are delighted by the riches conveniently gathered and selected: innumerable amusing or curious passages, and some good satire. Nevertheless, these later chapters disappointingly fail to match the first. Mr. Holden is most successful in tracing close correspondence with the serious controversies in the sermon parodies and the characters. In dramatic satire, however, the only correspondence established is the idea of moderation, common to Anglican satire and polemic. The account of the stage Puritan, the hypocrite, the libertine in disguise, is unsatisfactory. Although unable to find parallel accusations of hypocritical sexuality in serious polemic, Mr. Holden never doubts that the Puritan party was the object of this satire. He speaks of 'that fictitious entity, the typical Puritan', yet burkes the troublesome question of just how far the stage Puritan was an invention. This question, he asserts, is 'largely irrelevant'; but he does not tell us how to estimate the moral attitudes behind satire without considering its justice. Vacillation about the character of the Puritan is connected with vacillation in nomenclature: the accurate distinctions of the opening survey are not sustained. Thus 'Puritan' is

used to cover sectaries, even the Family of Love; and Tyndale and Becon are also Puritans—although the term is really a solecism before the late 1560's. True, the Elizabethans themselves used 'Puritan' loosely, particularly when, like Ormerod, they wished to prejudice an issue and associate Puritans with separatists. But the point is not picayune; no critic of anti-Puritan satire should take the word 'Puritan' at face value, for the label itself can be part of the satire.

One remains unconvinced that anti-Puritan satire can be regarded simply as one expression of the dispute between 'Puritan' and 'Anglican'. The desire of the worldly to discredit a godliness they feared must also have contributed; Silver-tongued Smith tells us that anyone preaching the vanity of temporal things was called an arch-puritan—and this complaint was echoed by contemporary theologians of every persuasion. Again, the satire's object may have been a moral type not directly identifiable with the Puritan party. The Puritan Greenham inveighs against hypocritical zeal in his *Seven Godly Sermons*. One calls to mind, also, the antinomian libertines who had earlier cashed in on the preaching of Justification by Faith. If Mr. Holden had gone to the background of sermon and miscellaneous literature, as distinct from official controversy, he would have been more likely to come to grips with such complications. There remain puzzling features in the Puritan of satire. Was he so often accused of hypocritical libertinism, of copulating with a Bible as his pillow, merely because the common degree of lewdness was more noticeable in a religious zealot? Or did the Puritan movement, as it grew in strength and size, deteriorate in the quality of some of its adherents? Chronological considerations, such as the great changes suffered by English Calvinism, are almost entirely abandoned in the latter part of the study. No attempt, for instance, is made to connect the rise of the stage Puritan with the increase of Puritan attacks on the stage from 1600 on.

While the book has a unity of purpose, it is not well arranged in detail. The relegation of almost all quotations to footnotes I found distracting. Moreover, it gives the impression that any one of a number of illustrations is as valuable as the next. The aim is admittedly to concentrate on the arguments themselves, and on the correspondences with theological controversy. But this concentration sometimes leads to a haphazard arrangement, a mere review of the texts without regard to their aesthetic qualities. When critical judgements are made, they are too often unsupported by illustration, and confined to a promiscuous award of 'eloquent'. Yet anti-Puritan satire presents the critic with a number of interesting topics, such as the highly developed stylistic parody in the burlesque sermons, or the tendency of satire of hypocrisy to take the compressed form of elaborate *doubles entendres*.

The comparison with serious polemical writing was a necessary first step in a critical approach to the satires, and we should be glad that this step is at last being taken. But the whole procedure of such a comparison is fraught with dangers. When Mr. Holden tells us that 'the satirists of the Puritan sermons simply echo what Whitgift, Hooker, and the skeptical Bacon had pointed out in their serious accounts', we suspect that violence has been done to the complex and reciprocal relationship between literature and systematic ideas.

A. D. S. FOWLER

John Gay. Social Critic. By SVEN M. ARMENS. Pp. x+262. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. 32s. net.

Mr. Armens believes that the chief reason why the writings of John Gay have been so often regarded as the pleasant but superficial productions of a pleasant but irresponsible man is that Gay's serious and thoughtful criticisms of contemporary society have been more or less ignored. Certainly neither the poems nor the plays have received the critical attention that their merits deserve. They have been enjoyed rather than studied. Swift called *The Beggar's Opera* 'a very severe satire upon the most pernicious villainies of mankind', but for most readers the satire is incidental to the humour and liveliness of a delightfully amusing musical play. *Trivia* and *The Shepherd's Week*, if they are read at all, are read in the same spirit.

But Mr. Armens maintains that to read Gay's works in this way is to mistake their true character; even the wit and humour of Gay, as of his fellow-Scriblerians, cannot be properly savoured except in relation to the author's satiric or didactic purpose. The persistence and importance of this purpose Mr. Armens demonstrates in his discussions of Gay's criticisms of eighteenth-century social, political, and economic morality, and of town life in general. The conclusion, that Gay

was a humanist upholding the Christian and classical values that he, Swift, and Pope sought to preserve in an age which they believed to be one of growing materialism, mechanism, and secularism, an age of weak morality and poor taste, an age of greed and injustice,

may not throw any new and unexpected light on Gay. But it was not Mr. Armens's intention to surprise; what he has set out to do and what he has quite effectively done is to emphasize the importance of an aspect of Gay's work which has been neglected.

It is a pity that this useful study should be marred by the presence of the irritants common to so many American doctoral dissertations—in particular, a tendency to distort the interpretation of passages in order to fit them into the neat pattern of a thesis, and a plague of far-fetched, inapposite, and unilluminating comparisons, drawn especially from 'world literature' and elementary anthropology.

Mr. Armens tries to interpret everything Gay wrote in terms of the opposition of town (corrupt, turbulent, and unnatural) and country (simple, peaceful, and natural). The introduction gives the reason for this procedure:

Since he is primarily a pastoral poet, the chief unifying theme in our conception of the thoughtful Gay must be the town and country contrast.

As a result of this dubious consequence, the unifying theme is pursued so determinedly that, when Gay omits the contrast, Mr. Armens inserts it. For instance, Gay's lines on the futility of funeral pomp conclude—

How short is life! how frail is human trust!
Is all this pomp for laying dust to dust?

The explication follows: 'All the luxury and aspiration of the town must return again to mere country dust.' It may be pedantic to question the significance of 'again' in that sentence (although too many of the sentences in this book will not bear close scrutiny), but one is entitled to ask what there is specifically rural in human dust. There are many similarly forced interpretations; this example was chosen only for its brevity.

Sometimes the explications of Mr. Armens are no more than flat and unnecessary paraphrases; sometimes they are strangely ingenious. When Bumkinet finds Grubbinol mourning the death of Blouzelinda, he first supposes that his friend is depressed by the approach of winter: Mr. Armens explains—

The intimacy of the man-nature relationship is almost that of the primitive tribes of the anthropological past, with their fertility rites mourning the death of the deity in winter, and celebrating his resurrection in spring, only in Gay's poem the similar concomitant moods or religious feelings are expressed in words instead of actual ceremonies.

After that we are not surprised to learn that Grubbinol's appeal to the swine to grunt their grief is a complex device 'to bring out the man-beast affinity', or that both 'relationship' and 'affinity' are 'indications of preromanticism'.

Jean de Meun, Spenser, and Guillaume de Loris are brought in to define Gay's 'attitude towards rural sex', and we are told that

we can picture [Gay] as a sort of Chrétien de Troyes reading a lay to Marie de France or as an Andreas Capellanus prescribing precise rules of devotion for lovers at the mercy of female judges.

(We can, of course, but what is the object of such a difficult exercise?) The townsfolk who enjoyed the violent amusements of eighteenth-century London are compared to the 'disintegrating social mass of unintegrated individuals' which filled the Roman amphitheatres, and after a particularly pointless comparison of Peachum and Lockit to gods, Mr. Armens concludes cryptically:

The false animal god of certain primitive tribes, in having human sacrifices offered to his fangs, had his friends die for him; the true God dies for his friends.

This is a small selection of the scraps of unintegrated learning that Mr. Armens inflicts on the reader. His useful and interesting book has no need for such naïve display.

C. H. PEAKE

Samuel Johnson's Parliamentary Reporting. *Debates in the Senate of Lilliput*. By BENJAMIN BEARD HOOVER. Pp. xii+227. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1953; London: Cambridge University Press, 1954. \$2.50; 21s. net.

There is no need to apologize for a full-scale study of 'the first large single body of prose' that we have from Johnson's hand. It was time that an attempt was made to tell us more about the *Debates in the Senate of Lilliput* than can be learned from the twelve-page appendix in Birkbeck Hill, and Mr. Hoover sets about his task in a manner which can be described as at once imaginative and businesslike.

He begins with a brief history of the reporting of parliamentary debates, mentions the reasons why Parliament jealously preserved the secrecy of its proceedings, and gives a more detailed account of the situation in the late seventeen-thirties immediately before Johnson began his work. The *Gentleman's Magazine* and its rival, the *London Magazine*, had been publishing reports since 1732; but when in 1738 the House of Commons resolved that such publication was a notorious breach of privilege, the magazines were reduced to subterfuges, the *London* representing that its reports were the proceedings of a political club of young noblemen and gentlemen, the *Gentleman's* more imaginatively pretending to offer accounts sent by Captain Gulliver's grandson of debates in the Senate of Lilliput. The reports were withheld until a parliamentary session was over; and instalments of two or more debates were often published in one number without regard to chronological order. To add to the confusion, the authenticity of the speeches is suspect. It is to this question of authenticity that Mr. Hoover devotes the largest section of his book. For deciding upon Johnson's own contribution he assembles enough evidence, mainly of a bibliographical and stylistic nature, in support of the traditional view that Johnson was 'sole composer' of the Debates from that of 25 November 1740 to that of 22-25 February 1742/3.

If an official record of the Debates had been preserved, it would be possible to compare this with Johnson's account and show precisely what Johnson did. Such a comparison would doubtless prove more satisfactory than what Mr. Hoover is able to provide; but it would have deprived the reader of the pleasure of watching the skilful examination of imperfect evidence. At best the collateral materials consist of a record made of debates in the House of Lords from shorthand notes by Bishop Secker; 'but to judge from the nature of his entries, he was not proficient at shorthand, if shorthand it was'. His manuscript consists of 'a series of statements and phrases without connectives'. It is incoherent in places owing to Secker's failing 'to put down all the points that were handled'. This is the best we have, and it was not available to Johnson; but when collated with the *London* and the *Gentleman's* versions of the Lords Debate of 13 February 1740/1, it is possible to show that Johnson's record contained an accurate account of the order of the speakers, that it varied in fullness from speech to speech, and probably recorded the details of the argument though without much concern for the main points made. The arguments on each side of the debate appear to be treated equally, though Johnson seems to be more interested in 'the larger moral aspects of the debate' and 'the relation of the people to their government' than the speakers themselves. A wider survey of the evidence is less favourable. Many of the speeches are established as 'products of Johnson's mind alone'; but he seems frequently to have had, as Murphy said, 'the subjects of discussion, the names of the speakers, the side they took, the order in which they rose', even though the lists were deficient, the order of the speakers confused, and the subjects of discussion imperfectly preserved. Johnson, however, made the most of his opportunities by shaping miscellaneous arguments into unified essays, and by elaborating for the Whigs 'persuasive arguments that must have run counter to his convictions'. The *Debates*, in fact, cannot be regarded 'as a vast, a Johnsonian, practical joke on the *Whig Dogs*'.

Then what are they? Mr. Hoover treads carefully in his final chapter on 'the Debates as Art'. 'Though always, in a measure, imaginative, they had usually some basis in fact, and were taken by the public as "reports", not as dramatic diversions.' There is some of the atmosphere of parliamentary exchange, but little variety of language between speakers and little detail; and the speeches appear more like essays designed to set 'before a large magazine audience the two extremes of a nationally absorbing issue and the relations of that issue to universal moral truths'. At the end of this short but well-conducted argument, the reader is persuaded that these 'essays' deserve more consideration than they have hitherto received.

JOHN BUTT

The George Eliot Letters. Edited by GORDON S. HAIGHT. Vol. I, pp. lxxx+375; Vol. II, pp. viii+513; Vol. III, pp. viii+475. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. £7. 7s. net.

These are the first three volumes of a new edition of the letters of George Eliot and her circle. A happy conjunction of intrinsically interesting material and impeccable presentation makes it a most valuable enterprise. The great enhancement of George Eliot's literary reputation in the last thirty years has not been paralleled by additions to the personal records; and her letters in particular have appeared very imperfectly. Those published before this edition are found for the most part in three books: Cross's *Life*, of 1885; *The Letters of George Eliot to Elma Stuart*, edited by Roland Stuart, 1909; and *George Eliot's Family Life and Letters*, edited by Arthur Paterson, 1928. They are far from complete. Cross's editorial methods are well known. He knew George Eliot only in her late sibylline phase; he was her husband during the last year of her life; and his 'reticence in three volumes', as Gladstone called it, was designed to present her formally dressed for public appearance. He rarely printed a complete letter, he conflated separate documents, transposed passages, pruned the vivacities, and suppressed as far as possible the less discreet episodes of George Eliot's early life. Elma Stuart was a disciple, and the exchange of fan-mail with her shows only a late and limited aspect of George Eliot's nature. The *Family Letters* are mainly affectionate and domestic. We can gauge the extent of what has been missing by Professor Haight's estimate that of the 2,760 items to appear in his complete edition, 1,452 are formerly unpublished, and that two-thirds of his text appears now for the first time.

The edition is not confined to George Eliot's letters alone: journal extracts are also included; and besides the 1,918 pieces by George Eliot herself there are 751 to her or about her. Of these the majority are by Lewes and the Blackwoods, with a fair sprinkling, in these volumes, from the Brays and Hennels. The first volume covers her Evangelical period, her loss of faith, and her early life in London at Chapman's house in the Strand. This last period has up to now been almost undocumented, since it was kept very dark by Cross. The second volume covers the editing of *The Westminster Review*, the early days with Lewes, and the

publication of *Scenes of Clerical Life*; the third the period of growing fame—of *Adam Bede*, *The Mill on the Floss*, and *Silas Marner*. There are three more volumes to come, and the result will undoubtedly be the fullest record of George Eliot's personal and intellectual activity available. The editing is admirable throughout. Mr. Haight's largest single sources have been the great George Eliot collection in Yale University Library and an extensive group of letters between George Eliot, Lewes, and the Blackwoods in the National Library of Scotland; but his edition brings together material from a large number of public and private collections. Biographical notices of the principal correspondents appear in the first volume; and an immense variety of detailed and attested information is provided in the footnotes—briefly, discreetly, and unobtrusively. It is possible that many readers will not need the identification of all the Biblical and Shakespearian quotations; but one can never be sure who will want what; and, as the editor observes, to have all the literary allusions gathered together in the index is a useful guide to George Eliot's reading.

As for the letters themselves, their interest needs no emphasis. It is greatly enhanced by Mr. Haight's plan of including, besides the Lewes material, the letters from the Brays, Hennells, and Blackwoods. A many-sided survey is thus made possible, instead of the limited view from the usual one-way street. We have always been familiar with George Eliot's massive and scrupulous intellect; but readers of *Cross* have little idea of her liveliness, humour, and unconventional humanity. And it is always good to be reminded again of the courage, the delicacy of feeling, and the solid, generous good will of the Lewes-Eliot household. These volumes are a notable addition to the growing tale of distinguished nineteenth-century scholarship: the only objection to them is their price.

GRAHAM HOUGH

The Unmediated Vision. An Interpretation of Wordsworth, Hopkins, Rilke and Valéry. By GEOFFREY H. HARTMAN. Pp. xiv+206. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. \$5.00; 40s. net.

Dr. Hartman's book in its original form was presented as a doctoral thesis at Yale. The method in the first four chapters is to take a single poem, examine it minutely, and bring into the discussion other works of the same poet. Otherwise the method avoids rigid uniformity. The four poems are 'Tintern Abbey' (or rather its opening 22 lines), 'The Windhover', 'Die Erwachsene', and 'La Dormeuse'. In the fifth chapter, 'Pure Representation', the four poets are considered again as having each 'tried to conceive a pure representation distinguished from that of Jewish or medieval Christian thought in that its motive and terminal object is identified not with the God of the Testaments, but with Nature, the body, or human consciousness'. It appears, then, that by the *Unmediated Vision* Dr. Hartman means vision which is quite independent and does not use a biblical or any other standard of reference. Roughly speaking, that would mean Wordsworth as contrasted with Milton. In this world, at least, a Dante could dispense with a Virgil.

The sixth and last chapter is called 'The New Perseus'. The old Perseus used mediated vision. He looked at Medusa in the mirror provided by Athene. Unmediated vision does without that mirror, yet it appears that 'the quest of the new Perseus becomes a quest for tokens of mediation. . . . The mirror must be restored'. These tokens may be found in the vision itself, e.g. by Wordsworth in his 'sensitivity to atmospheric media'. In fact, when 'the new Perseus looks directly at the Medusa two things are found to happen: he turns into stone, or draws the mediatory mirror out of his own eyes'.

Dr. Hartman has not started with a theory and fitted his poets to it. He has started with his poets and arrived at his theory. Nevertheless, the value of his theory must be in proportion to the backward light it throws on the poets. This is not negligible and is not invalidated by the obvious objections to the theory. It would not be much of an exaggeration to say that all poets, in so far as they have vision, have unmediated vision. The difference after which Dr. Hartman is feeling is in their interpretation of their vision. They cannot use their vision for poetry without 'mediation'. I think this must be what Dr. Hartman really means by his conclusion.

He is very learned and his work is exploratory. The two chief faults of his book are an excessive use of abstract language and a tendency to overdo the minute examination of his texts. Both faults are intermittent only. There are too many words like 'reification' and 'relational', too many sentences without a significant verb. The quiet little opening of 'Tintern Abbey' is oppressed beneath a weight of commentary and comparison. There are even a few absurdities, such as the finding of a pun in Wordsworth's 'Authentic tidings of invisible things' or of esoteric significance in a factual statement in Dorothy's journal. Maladroitness of erudition or comment I find chiefly, but not exclusively, in the Wordsworth chapter.

Some of this might have been avoided by a more detailed background knowledge of Wordsworth. There is, however, a real problem here for a young man with an obviously brilliant mind, breadth of learning, and deep interest in the fundamental mystery of poetry. His lack of specialization must sometimes let him go wrong. Yet the opposite type may stick in a pedantic parochialism. Dr. Hartman, on the contrary, has a way of getting at wide and acceptable generalizations, as when he speaks of Wordsworth's 'dialectic of love between man and nature' or declares that 'the sense of pressure or stress is the sixth and radical sense in the experience of Hopkins'. Hopkins's tight-packed lines are specially suitable for Dr. Hartman's method; and I find that chapter, though not without blemishes, the most satisfying in a book which is almost a remarkable book, contains much of interest and much of real value, but is perhaps just a little unripe.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

Poetry and Dogma. By MALCOLM MACKENZIE ROSS. Pp. xiv+256. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954. \$5.

In his foreword Mr. Ross states that he is attempting 'to present some of the consequences for religious poetry in England of the Protestant revision of

Eucharistic dogma'. In the body of the book he expresses his intention more obscurely by a recurrent astronomical metaphor, declaring that he is discussing 'a change in the firmament of Christian symbol', which is 'a change in the fixed star itself', the Eucharist being, in his view, the prime Christian symbol.

Seventeenth-century literature presents two peculiar difficulties today. Although it is now fashionable to deprecate any too great enthusiasm for the metaphysical poets, the enthusiasm which they have aroused in this century means that they have appeared to speak very particularly 'to our condition'. Almost everyone, therefore, who works in the earlier seventeenth century is tempted to look in it for ammunition for modern battles. The second difficulty is that much of the finest poetry of the period is not only specifically Christian but employs theological language and is penetrated with theological ideas. The student of such literature must be not only something of an historian but also something of a theologian. But neither history nor theology can be picked up at second-hand. The author of this book seems quite unaware of the dangers of his enterprise.

He has read Dom Gregory Dix's beautiful, brilliant, and tendentious book, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, E. C. Messenger's *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*, and Dr. Edwyn Bevan's *Symbolism and Belief*. He shows, as far as I can see, no first-hand acquaintance with the fifteen hundred years of Christian thought and experience out of which the conflicts of the Reformation were born; he is unconscious that the problems which he is discussing are not purely English ones, and he is insensitive to the related problems of Christianity and the visual arts. The book is wholly deficient in historical sense and its theological pronouncements are of a shocking crudity. The author has some acquaintance with a few modern theological writers, and on this basis pronounces with confidence on what is the 'authentic Catholic tradition'. He does not seem to suspect that dogma, like other products of human experience, may itself have a history. He has to own sadly that Crashaw, although holding to 'the authentic Catholic doctrine', does not, any more than Herbert, grasp the idea of 'the corporate Eucharistic act'. Why should he? Crashaw and Herbert, though opposed on certain doctrinal points, share ignorance of the works of M. Jacques Maritain and his school. When Mr. Ross writes that 'the Christian artist, when he knows what he is about, respects his medium, respects the material fact and the historical event', I can only say that such respect is not the most obvious feature of the mosaics at Ravenna, which were produced without the help of those modern Catholic writers who have been concerned to draw out the social implications of the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is impertinence for Mr. Ross to distinguish Christian artists who 'know what they are about' from others. The subjectivity and Platonism which he condemns as alien to 'the true Catholic tradition' is one of the permanent and precious strands in the web of Christian thought from the New Testament, through the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century, to the present day.

As a study of the religious poetry of the seventeenth century I can find nothing of value in this book and much to deplore. Its use of terms is so imprecise that it is difficult to attach any meaning to some of its sentences. It is burdened by a formidable stock of abstractions, some of which, such as 'extricationism', are

new to me. Its manner may be represented by the following comment on the 'personalization of the royalist symbol' in England: 'Whatever one's theological bias, one must perforce admit that the transcendent symbolic potential of the old Mary cult is roofed over and squatted by this new English cult, which, rather than offering and raising the temporal order to the divine, depresses a soaring form of worship to the merest political and personal idolatry' (p. 122). My theological bias is, I suspect, not very different from Mr. Ross's; it is on other grounds that I object to this style of writing. The level at which the relation of Church and State is discussed can be gauged from the following comment: 'Prayers for the king (and his kin) occupy a much larger place in the Anglican service than do prayers for the Pope (and his intentions) in the Catholic rite' (p. 111); reliability of historical reference by the statement that 'Nothing points more clearly to the fragmentation of Caroline culture than the realization that both Herbert and Lovelace were the king's men' (p. 142).

The root of the trouble is that Mr. Ross is not really concerned to investigate the remarkable body of religious poetry which was written in England in the first half of the seventeenth century. His concern is with the possibility of a revival of Christian poetry today. On this subject, towards the end of his book, he has interesting and pertinent things to say, as he has on the modern critical quarrel over Milton. With his eye on our present discontents he has invented a false problem: 'the decline of a specifically Christian poetry in the seventeenth century' (p. 21). The real problem is surely not its decline but its existence. Why was this one of the few periods in the course of nearly two thousand years in which a specifically Christian poetry, as distinct from pious versifying, flourished? History confutes the author's simple dogmatic assumption that there should be no quarrel between Christ and Apollo.

HELEN GARDNER

SHORT NOTICES

Courtship in Shakespeare: Its Relation to the Tradition of Courtly Love. By WILLIAM G. MEADER. Pp. x+266. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. 32s. net.

This is a typical example of what happens when a researcher is set to examine some general theme 'in' Shakespeare, without any real concern for drama as such. Sometimes it is more than ordinarily absurd—'It cannot be assumed that the tears for Juliet are any more real than those for Rosaline . . . the mere distinction between the psychosomatic and the romantic does not necessarily affect the degree of the suffering'—and sometimes one feels that Mr. Meader himself has revolted against the whole enterprise in deliberate parody—'The blush, by no means a recent development in the sixteenth century, did seem to acquire more popularity than it had earlier, and it seemed to be used both by the lover and the beloved'—but in the main the tediousness and irrelevance are inherent in the tradition. Mr. Meader has some gift of arrangement and exposition, and the discussion of *Troilus and Cressida* in the last chapter shows that, when he allows himself to look at a play as a whole, he is capable of something much better than most of what he has given us here. I doubt whether in years to come he will feel unmixed gratitude towards the eminent scholars who encouraged him to write this book, and to publish it in its present form.

J. C. MAXWELL

Motive and Method in *The Cantos* of Ezra Pound. Edited by LEWIS LEARY.

Pp. viii+135 (English Institute Essays, 1953). New York: Columbia University Press, 1954; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. 22s. net.

In these four essays Pound is examined in a spirit of reverence and not of inquiry. His own theory about *The Cantos* is stated most fully in Guy Kenner's opening essay: 'The key to Pound's method throughout the *Cantos* is his conviction that the things the poet sees in the sea of events are really there. They are not "creations" of his.' Not, it may be thought, a very unusual conviction, and certainly a desirable one. The question is whether the poem these critics think they see is really there for many besides themselves. Pound's plan was to combine two themes, that of the Descent into Hades from Homer and that of Metamorphoses from Ovid with a structure modelled upon Dante. Pound's constant preoccupation with the great is an undoubted virtue, but it may be questioned whether his relation to them is quite that suggested: 'The old music laid up in archives was of no use to anyone till Dolmetsch happened along: nor were Homer's chthonic vigor or Propertius' elaborate wit active in the Anglo Saxon consciousness till Ezra Pound recreated them' (p. 28).

To those who wish to know something of Pound's intentions in *The Cantos*, this little work may serve as a useful guide. To those who cannot accept the will for the deed, the lack of critical evaluation may prove exasperating. Great poetry has been indeed produced by men in a plight as desperate as Pound's: but that a tremendous intellectual synthesis embracing all knowledge from religion to monetary theory should emerge may be taken as more unlikely. The grander the claims made for Pound by himself and his disciples, the deeper the scepticism of the unconverted. It is really Pound and not the professional anthropologists who are to decide that Fulgentius is the great, indeed almost the only modern exponent of his science. It is Pound who is to give the O.K. to the gods (not to God). And of some of the statements it can only be said, in the words of Wellington: 'Sir, if you believe that, you will believe anything.'

M. C. BRADBROOK

The Novello Cowden Clarke Collection. Pp. 19. Leeds: The Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, 1955. 2s. net.

This pamphlet describes a collection given to Leeds University by great-granddaughters of Vincent Novello, whose eldest daughter married Keats's friend, Charles Cowden Clarke. It includes '975 volumes, 70 pamphlets, 165 unbound periodical parts, 46 manuscripts, 450 autograph letters (including transcripts and rough drafts)' and other miscellaneous items. Most of the books are not of primary importance, though some contain interesting marginalia, but the collection as a whole, and especially the letters, will have to be consulted by anyone doing detailed work on the persons concerned, chiefly Leigh Hunt and his friends. The letters include the originals of many already published or published in part and several which are unpublished: among these last are letters by Leigh Hunt, Mary Shelley, Charles Lamb, and Charles Dickens.

A hand-list of the books and manuscripts is available on request to the keeper of the Brotherton Collection, The Brotherton Library, The University of Leeds.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

ANGLIA

Band 73, Heft 4, 1956

OE. poetic diction and the interpretation of *The Wanderer*, *The Seafarer*, and *The Penitent's Prayer* (E. G. Stanley), 413-66.

Die 'Leges Molmutinae', ein Beitrag zum Problem der historischen Wahrheit und politischen Absicht bei Geoffrey von Monmouth (Heinrich Pähler), 516-18.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xvii, No. 3, June 1956

Is English a Germanic language? (R. W. Zandvoort), 83-92.

King James's bishops (John Rogan), 93-99.

Martin Joseph Routh and his books in Durham University Library (A. I. Doyle), 100-7.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxvii, No. 3, June 1956

Late OE. word-order (O. Funke), 99-104.

The weakening of OE. unstressed *i* to *e* and the date of Cynewulf (G. Storms), 104-10.

'As fer as last Ytaille' (A. A. Prins), 111-16.

Of some cases of restriction of meaning (H. Schreuder), 117-24.

Sarbiewski, Watts and the later metaphysical tradition (T. A. Birrell), 125-32.

Laureates in Elysium: Sir William Davenant and Robert Southey (J. G. Riewald), 133-40.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

IX^e Année, No. 2, avril-juin 1956

Les nouveaux conservateurs américains (Cyrille Arnavon), 97-121.

L'année T. E. Lawrence (Etiemble), 122-30.

Spenser's 'pleasing Alcon' (Waldo F. McNeir), 136-40.

HISTORY

Vol. xl, Nos. 138 and 139, February and June 1955

Emigration from the British Isles to the New World, 1765-1775 (George R. Mellor), 68-83.

The imperial style of the tenth century Anglo-Saxon kings (H. R. Loyne), 111-15.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY

Vol. lv, No. 1, January 1956

Wordsworth's early drafts of *The Ruined Cottage* in 1797-98 (Thomas M. Raysor), 1-7.

The Owl and the Nightingale and Christian dialectic (Douglas L. Peterson), 13-26.

Milton's [*Index Poeticus*]-the *Theatrum Poetarum* by Edward Phillips (Harris Fletcher), 35-40.

The probable time of composition of Smart's *Song to David*, *Psalms*, and *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* (Arthur Sherbo), 41-57.

The troubled fountain: Erasmus formulates a Shakespearian simile (Rolf Soellner), 70-74.

Whitman and Epictetus: the stoical element in *Leaves of Grass* (C. E. Pulos), 75-84.

LIBRARY CHRONICLE, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Vol. v, No. 4, Spring 1956

More about *A Boke of Balettes*, 1547-1549 (Robert Adger Law), 3-5.

Byron and his circle: recent manuscript acquisitions (Willis W. Pratt), 16-25.

Marginalia on Coventry Patmore (George O. Marshall, Jr.), 32-33.

442 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MODERN FICTION STUDIES

Vol. ii, No. 2, May 1956

- The attitude of fiction (Simon O. Lesser), 47-55.
- Conrad's underworld (Robert O. Evans), 56-62.
- Permanence and change in *The Edwardians* and *Told By An Idiot* (W. R. Irwin), 63-67.
- Two manuscripts by Paul M. Léon concerning James Joyce (Joseph Prescott), 71-76.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxi, No. 4, April 1956

- Three notes on *Beowulf* (Vladimir Jelinek), 239-42.
- A new satirical proclamation (Robert R. Raymo), 243-4.
- [About 1453.]
- A political action poem, 1463 (Rossell Hope Robbins), 245-8.
- Mors solvit omnia (Robert R. Raymo), 249.
- Chaucerian character names in Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes* (Alain Renoir), 249-56.
- Donne's compass figure (D. C. Allen), 256-7.
- The text of Cibber's *She wou'd*, and *She wou'd not* (William M. Peterson), 258-62.
- An Edward Lear letter to Wilkie Collins (David Shusterman), 262-4.
- Suetonius, Symonds, and Gibbon in *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (R. D. Brown), 264.
- Another early use of 'Autumnal' (Chandler B. Beall), 269-70.
- An early use of the feminine form of the word *Heir* (Mary Forster Hamilton), 270-1.

Vol. lxxi, No. 5, May 1956

- Beowulf* 168-9 (Robert Howren), 317-18.
- The structure of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Sylvan Barnet), 319.
- 'Four and twenty yer' again (Clifford A. Nault, Jr.), 319-21.
- 'Chaucer's 'Fowle Ok' and *The*

Pardoner's Tale (Frederick H. Candelaria), 321-2.

Epitaphium Damonis: lines 9-13 and the date of composition (John T. Shawcross), 322-4.

Paradise Lost, I, 254-5 (D. C. Allen), 324-6.

The influence of the *Aeneid* on Fielding's *Amelia* (Lyll H. Powers), 330-6.

Ralph Cudworth and Fielding's *Amelia* (Ralph W. Rader), 336-8.

Wordsworth and John Constable (Paul M. Zall), 338.

Coleridge, T. S. Eliot, and organicism (Martin Steinmann, Jr.), 338-40.

Notes on Keats's letters (Jack Stillinger), 340-2.

The childhood of James's American innocents (Edmond L. Volpe), 345-7.

'Copertiment' and 'Copurtenaunce' (Leonard Nathanson), 349-50.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. li, No. 3, July 1956

- Webster and Cervantes (F. M. Todd), 321-3.
- Stage directions in 'The Castell of Perseverance' (James Willis), 404-5.
- Two notes on Donne (A. J. Smith), 405-7.
- Two allusions in Lovelace's poems (E. E. Duncan-Jones), 407-9.
- Smollett's reading in psychiatry (Richard A. Hunter and Ida Macalpine), 409-11.
- Dorothy Wordsworth and the Coleridges: a new letter (Frederick L. Beaty), 411-13.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. liii, No. 4, May 1956

- The typology of *Paradise Regained* (Northrop Frye), 227-38.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

40ste Jaarg., Afl. 2, 1 April 1956

- Between laughter and humour in the eighteenth century (Marie Ramondt), 128-38.

Shakespeare en Horatius (P. Maximilianus), 144.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. lvii, Nos. 1-2, 30 April 1956

'The English Boccaccio' (Claud E. Jones), 40-51.
[Thomas Atchlow.]

NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION

Vol. xi, No. 1, June 1956

Toward a revaluation of *The Mill on the Floss* (Bernard J. Paris), 18-31.
Sir Walter Besant: novelist (Part Two) (Fred W. Boege), 32-60.
[See *ibid.*, x, 249-80.]

The portrait of Huxley in Mallock's *New Republic* (J. Max Patrick), 61-69.

Dickens and the Americans: an unnoticed letter (James D. Rust), 70-72.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. iii, N.S., No. 5, May 1956

The Auchinleck 'St. Margaret' and 'St. Katherine' (A. J. Bliss), 186-8.
'The Arte of English Poesie' (1589) (Roderick L. Eagle), 188-90.

Thomas Lodge and Shakespeare (Charles A. O. Fox), 190.

Milton and Neaera's hair (R. J. Schoeck), 190-1.

The Golden Age and Volpone's address to his gold (R. P. Draper), 191-2.

An actor-reporter in 'The Merry Wives of Windsor' (C. A. Greer), 192-4.

Milton's first marriage (Roland Mushat Frye), 200-2.

A Milton-Claudian parallel (John M. Steadman), 202.

Milton's Sonnet 23 (John T. Shawcross), 202-4.

The Rover—1714 (Claud E. Jones), 206-10.

Johnson and Lady Macbeth (Susie I. Tucker), 210-11.

The quarto edition of James Thomson's works, 1762 (T. R. Francis), 211-12.

A Sterne letter re-dated (Louis T. Milic), 212-13.

The text of Wordsworth's 'Essay upon Epitaphs' (W. J. Owen), 214-15.
Shelley and the Windsor stage, 1815 (W. G. Bebbington), 215-16.
Nursemaid to the Shelleys (Louise Schutz Boas), 216-17.

[Continued *ibid.*, 309-10.]

J. P. Collier and his Essex papers (Sydney Race), 218-19.

Ruskin as Utopist (W. H. G. Armytage), 219-24.

Book VIII of 'Ecclesiastical Polity' (Donald S. Lawless), 224-5.

Carew and Shakespeare (Alan J. Biggs), 225.

Vol. iii, N.S., No. 6, June 1956

The Augustinian and possibly West Midland origin of the Ancrén Riwe (D. S. Brewer), 232-5.

Havelock, lines 1100-1102 (N. E. Osselton), 236.

An uncollected Shakespeare allusion (J. C. Maxwell), 236.

Sir Thomas Urquhart's 'Trisotetras' (Kelsie B. Harder), 237-9.

Henry Wharton and the Lambeth manuscript of the 'Flores Historiarum' (John Taylor), 240-1.

Arthur Brooke and the imagery of 'Romeo and Juliet' (Kenneth Muir), 241-3.

Seneca and Shakespeare (Kenneth Muir), 243-4.

Ovid metamorphosed: Marston, Webster, and Nathaniel Lee (Gustav Cross), 244-5.

A contemporary account of the Popish Plot (Ruth M. Faurot), 245-6.

On the background of Peele's 'Araynement of Paris' (Inga-Stina Ekeblad), 246-9.

'Lycidas' and Lucan (E. E. Duncan-Jones), 249.

Milton's 'two-handed engine' and Jehan Gerard (John M. Steadman), 249-50.

Samuel Hartlib's Utopia (R. H. Bowers), 251-2.

Steele quotes two great divines (John C. Stephens, Jr.), 252-3.
 Politics and the climate of economic opinion, 1660-1688 (D. G. C. Allan), 254-8.
 Smollett's letter to Samuel Mitchelson (Lewis M. Knapp), 262.
 Another self-quotation in Johnson's 'Dictionary' (W. R. Keast), 262.
 David Garrick and 'The London Cuckolds' (Anon.), 263-4.
 Coleridge's 'great circulating library' (J. B. Beer), 264.
 'The Revolt of Islam' and Byron's 'The Corsair' (Ben W. Griffith), 265.
 An Arnold-Clough letter: references to Carlyle and Tennyson (Kenneth Allott), 267.

Vol. iii, N.S., No. 7, July 1956

Aphorism—an aspect of Euphuism (Robert O. Evans), 278-9.
 Robert of Gloucester's 'Chronicle': some additions to the O.E.D. (Anon.), 279-81.
 Falstaff's death: Shakespeare or Theobald? (Hilda M. Hulme), 283-7.
 Middleton's 'The Phoenix' as a royal play (N. W. Bawcutt), 287-8.
 Spenser's 'Epithalamion' as inspiration for Milton's 'L'Allegro' and 'Il Penseroso' (Nan Cooke Carpenter), 289-92.
 Ghost-stories before Defoe (Coleman O. Parsons), 293-8.
 An early newspaper reference to Chaucer (Joseph Frank), 298.
 Source notes for Dryden, Wycherley and Otway (D. Biggins), 298-301.
 The founding of Dr. Johnson's Literary Club (C. N. Fifer), 302-3.
 Jane Austen's technique (Cecil C. Seronsy), 303-5.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxxi, No. 3, June 1956

James Joyce: barnacle goose and lapwing (Maurice Beebe), 302-20.

Irish folk songs in *Ulysses* (Mabel P. Worthington), 321-39.
 Charles Newman and his brothers (Martin J. Svaglic), 370-85.
 Wordsworth's dim and perilous way (Edward E. Bostetter), 433-50.
 Etherege at Constantinople (Thomas H. Fujimura), 465-81.
 The pains of the afterworld: fire, wind, and ice in Milton and Shakespeare (John E. Hankins), 482-95.
 Malory's treatment of the Sankgreall (Charles Moorman), 496-509.
 William Macmath and F. J. Child (James D. Reppert), 510-20.
 Structure and meaning in the *Parlement of Foules* (Robert Worth Frank, Jr.), 530-9.
 That dreamer once more (Stephen Manning), 540-1.
 [The Book of the Duchess.]
 Three Carlyle documents (George J. Worth), 542-4.

RIVISTA DI LETTERATURE MODERNE E COMPARATE

Anno ix, No. 1, Gennaio-Marzo 1956
 Critica e filologia Shakespeariana nell'epoca romantica (Napoleone Orsini), 5-16.

STUDIES IN ENGLISH, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Vol. xxxiv, 1955

The Finnsburg fragment 34a: *hwearflacra hrær* (Winfred Philipp Lehmann), 1-5.
 Theory and practice in English versions of *Orlando Furioso* (Lucetta J. Teagarden), 18-34.
 Sir Thomas Elyot and the Lanquet-Cooper *Chronicle* (D. T. Starnes), 35-42.
 Guessing about the youthful Shakespeare (Robert Adger Law), 43-50.
 Abraham Fleming, writer and editor (Sarah C. Dodson), 51-66.
 Hazlitt and the theater (Alvin Whitley), 67-100.
 Structure and plot in *The Warden* (Maude Houston), 107-13.

Humor in Emerson's *Journals* (Arthur M. Cory), 114-24.
 Andrew Lang and *Longman's Magazine*, 1882-1905 (Oscar Maurer), 152-78.
 The origins of Stephen Crane's literary creed (James B. Colvert), 179-88.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. liii, No. 2, April 1956

Britain among the Fortunate Isles (Josephine Waters Bennett), 114-40.

On Spenser's *Muiopotmos* (Don Cameron Allen), 141-58.

The authorship of *A Breviary of the History of England* (Rudolf B. Gottfried), 172-90.

The techniques and function of the Renaissance paradox (A. E. Malloch), 191-203.

Sir Thomas Browne: the relationship of *Urn Burial* and *The Garden of Cyrus* (Frank L. Huntley), 204-19.
 Milton's English poetical vocabulary (Evert Mordecai Clark), 220-38.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

January-June, 1956.

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1956 the date of each publication.]

- ADAMS, R. M. *Ikon: John Milton and the Modern Critics*. Ithaca; London, 1955. pp. xx+232. 30s.
- ANCRENE RIWLE. *Rendered into Modern English* by M. B. Salu. 1955. pp. xxviii+196. 15s.
- BANTOCK, G. H. L. H. Myers. *A Critical Study*. pp. x+158. 15s.
- BAXTER, J. K. *The Fire and the Anvil. Notes on Modern Poetry*. Wellington, 1955; London. pp. 78. 7s. 6d.
- BENTLEY, G. E. *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. Plays and Playwrights*. Oxford. Vol. III, pp. xii+470; Vol. IV, pp. 471-960; Vol. V, pp. 961-1456. £7. 7s.
- BLAIR, P. H. *An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge. pp. xvi+382. 30s.
- BLONDEL, J. Emily Brontë. *Expérience spirituelle et création poétique*. Clermont-Ferrand, 1955. pp. 452. Fr. 1,200.
- BODMER, D. *Die granadinischen Romanzen in der europäischen Literatur*. Zürich, 1955. pp. 116+XII. Fr. 12.
- BROWNING, R. *Selected Poems*, ed. J. Reeves. pp. xxxiv+156. 8s. 6d.
- CLEMEN, W. *Clarences Traum und Ermordung*. München, 1955. pp. 46. DM. 4.50.
- COLERIDGE, S. T. *Collected Letters*, ed. E. L. Griggs. Oxford. Vol. I, pp. xl+660; Vol. II, pp. viii+661-1220. £5. 5s.
- CRAWFORD, T. *The Edinburgh Review and Romantic Poetry* (1802-29). Auckland, 1955. pp. 42. 4s.
- CULLER, A. D. *The Imperial Intellect. A Study of Cardinal Newman's Educational Ideal*. New Haven, 1955; London. pp. xviii+328. 40s.
- EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY. *The Bibliotheca Historica of Diodorus Siculus*, by John Skelton, ed. F. M. Salter and H. L. R. Edwards. Vol. I. pp. xviii+396. 42s.
- *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwe*, ed. from British Museum MS. Royal 8 C.1. By A. C. Baugh. pp. xii+58. 20s.
- ELIOT, G. *Letters*, ed. G. S. Haight. London; New Haven. Vol. IV, pp. viii+502; Vol. V, pp. viii+476; Vol. VI, pp. viii+440; Vol. VII, pp. x+536. £10. 10s.
- *Middlemarch*, ed. G. S. Haight. Boston. pp. xxiv+614. \$1.20.
- ERÄMETSÄ, E. *Englische Lehnprägungen in der deutschen Empfindsamkeit des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Helsinki, 1955. pp. 136. Mk. 500.
- EVANS, A. J. *Shakespeare's Magic Circle*. pp. 160. 15s.
- FOXON, D. *The Technique of Bibliography*. Cambridge, 1955. pp. 20. 3s.
- FRASER, R. A. (ed.). *The Court of Venus*. Durham, North Carolina, 1955; London. pp. xii+168. 34s.
- FRÉCHET, R. *George Borrow*. Paris. pp. xii+382.
- GÉRARD, A. *L'Idée romantique de la poésie en Angleterre*. Paris, 1955. pp. 416. Fr. 1,000.
- GIBBON, E. *Letters*, ed. J. E. Norton. Vol. I, pp. xxxii+408; Vol. II, pp. xvi+424; Vol. III, pp. xvi+464. £8. 8s.

- GREG, W. W. *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing between 1550 and 1650*. Oxford. pp. viii+132. 21s.
- HAKLUYT SOCIETY. *The Roanoke Voyages 1584-1590*, ed. D. B. Quinn. Vol. I, pp. xxxvi+496; Vol. II, pp. vi+497-1004. £6.
- HANNESSON, J. S. *Bibliography of the Eddas*. New York, 1955; London. pp. xiv+110. 32s.
- HEILMAN, R. B. *Magic in the Web. Action and Language in Othello*. Lexington, 1956. pp. viii+298. \$5.
- HERRICK, R. *Poetical Works*, ed. L. C. Martin. Oxford. pp. xl+632. 63s.
- HEWITT, R. M. (1887-1948). *A Selection from his Literary Remains*, ed. V. de S. Pinto. Oxford, 1955. pp. vi+150. 10s. 6d.
- HOLMBERG, B. *James Douglas on English Pronunciation c. 1740*. Lund. pp. 354. Kr. 26.
- INDEX SOCIETY. *Checklist of the Correspondence of Edmund Burke*, by T. W. Copeland and M. S. Smith. Oxford, 1955. pp. xviii+482. 70s.
- IRVING, W. H. *The Providence of Wit in the English Letter Writers*. Durham, North Carolina, 1955; London. pp. vi+382. 56s. 6d.
- JONES, D. *Everyman's English Pronouncing Dictionary*. [11th edn.]. pp. xlv+538. 18s.
- *Outline of English Phonetics*. [8th edn.]. Cambridge. pp. xx+378. 21s.
- JONES, G. (ed.). *Welsh Short Stories*. pp. xvi+330. 6s.
- KELSO, R. *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance*. Urbana. pp. xii+476. \$6.50.
- KITTO, H. D. F. *Form and Meaning in Drama. A Study of Six Greek Plays and of Hamlet*. pp. x+342. 30s.
- KREUZER, R. *Elements of Poetry*. New York; London. pp. xiv+256. £1.0s. 6d.
- LAWRENCE, D. H. *Selected Literary Criticism*, ed. A. Beal. pp. xii+436. 21s.
- LEHNERT, M. *Poetry and Prose of the Anglo-Saxons*. Dictionary. Berlin. pp. 248.
- LEVER, J. W. *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet*. pp. x+282. 25s.
- LINDSAY, J. *George Meredith*. pp. 420. 30s.
- McKILLOP, A. D. *The Early Masters of English Fiction*. Lawrence, Kansas. pp. x+234. \$5.
- MALONE SOCIETY. *The Poor Man's Comfort*, by R. Daborne. pp. xviii+96; *July and Julian*. pp. xxiv+46; *Dick of Devonshire*. pp. xx+86. Oxford.
- MELCHIORI, G. *The Tightrope Walkers. Essays on Mannerism in Modern English Literature*. pp. x+278. 25s.
- MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY, ed. H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn. Parts F. 3, F. 4. Ann Arbor: London, 1955, 1956. pp. 629-952. Each 21s.
- MUELLER, I. W. *John Stuart Mill and French Thought*. Urbana. pp. xii+276. \$4.
- NOTES AND QUERIES. *Fifteenth General Index*. pp. 215. 30s.
- NUGENT, E. M. (ed.). *The Thought and Culture of the English Renaissance. An Anthology of Tudor Prose 1481-1555*. Cambridge. pp. xx+704. 37s. 6d.
- POETRY AND CHILDREN. *Central Committee on the Teaching of English in the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire*. pp. viii+86. 7s. 6d.
- PRAZ, M. *The Hero in Eclipse in Victorian Fiction*, tr. A. Davidson. pp. viii+478. 45s.
- QUINN, Sister M. B. *The Metamorphic Tradition in Modern Poetry*. New Brunswick, 1955. pp. xii+264. \$4.50.
- ROBBINS, R. H. (ed.). *Secular Lyrics of XIVth and XVth Centuries*. [2nd edn.]. Oxford, 1955. pp. lviii+332. 30s.
- ROSENBERG, E. *Leicester, Patron of Letters*. New York, 1955; London. pp. xx+396. 42s.
- ROYAL SOCIETY OF LITERATURE. *Essays by Divers Hands*. N.S. XXVIII, ed. Angela Thirkell. pp. xiv+154. 15s.
- SCHAAR, C. *The Golden Mirror. Studies in Chaucer's Descriptive Technique and its Literary Background*. Lund, 1955. pp. viii+526. Kr. 50.
- SCHREIBER, G. *Irland im deutschen und abendländischen Sakralraum*. Köln. pp. 120. DM. 9.
- SCOTTISH TEXT SOCIETY. *Devotional Pieces in Verse and Prose from MS. Arundel 285 and MS. Harleian 6919*, ed. J. A. W. Bennett. Edinburgh, 1955. pp. xxxviii+350.
- *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. J. Craigie. Vol. I. Edinburgh, 1955. pp. civ+334+10.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. P. G. Phialas. pp. xii+172; *Henry the Fifth*, ed. R. J. Dorius. pp. x+166;

- The Tempest, ed. D. Horne. pp. viii+106 (Yale Shakespeare, revd. edn.). New Haven, 1955; London. Each \$1.50; 12s.
- Richard II, ed. M. W. Black (New Variorum Shakespeare). Philadelphia, 1955; London. pp. xxxii+656.
- SHAKESPEARE SURVEY 9, ed. A. Nicoll. Cambridge. pp. viii+168. 21s.
- SISSON, C. J. New Readings in Shakespeare. Cambridge. Vol. I, pp. x+218; Vol. II, pp. viii+300. 45s.
- SKELTON, R. The Poetic Pattern. pp. x+228. 21s.
- STAMM, R. (ed.). Die Kunstformen des Barockzeitalters. Bern. pp. 448. Fr. 13.80.
- STUDIES IN BIBLIOGRAPHY. Vol. VIII, ed. F. Bowers. Charlottesville. pp. iv+276. \$6.
- STUDIES in Memory of John Jay Parry. By members of the English Department, University of Illinois. Urbana, 1955. pp. iv+224.
- SWIFT, J. An Enquiry into the Behavior of the Queen's Last Ministry, ed. I. Ehrenpreis. Bloomington. pp. xlv+110. \$3.50.
- THOMSON, J. A. K. Classical Influences on English Prose. pp. xiv+304. 16s.
- TIBBLE, J. and A. John Clare. pp. xii+216. 25s.
- TREWIN, J. C. Verse Drama since 1800. Cambridge. pp. 28. 2s. 6d.
- VILJOEN, H. G. Ruskin's Scottish Heritage. Urbana. pp. viii+284. \$3.75.
- WAHRIG, G. Englisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Leipzig, 1955. pp. xii+784. DM. 10.80.
- WALPOLE, H. Correspondence with William Mason, ed. W. S. Lewis, Grover Cronin, Jr. and Charles H. Bennett. New Haven, 1955; London. Vol. I, pp. lvi+494; Vol. II, pp. viii+478. £8.
- WEBER, C. A., and others (edd.). Sprache und Literatur Englands und Amerikas. Lehrgangsvorträge der Akademie Comburg. Band II. Tübingen. pp. 164. DM. 10.

INDEX

- Agrippa, Henricus Cornelius. See Hamilton, A. C. (art.).
- Albrecht, William P., *The Loathly Lady in 'Thomas of Erceeldoune'*, noticed, 331.
- Allen, Don Cameron, *The Harmonious Vision: Studies in Milton's Poetry*, noticed, 106.
- Anderson, D. M., note by, Sir Thomas Wilson's Translation of Montemayor's *Diana*, 176.
- Armens, Sven M., *John Gay. Social Critic*, revd., 432.
- Armstrong, William A., art. by, Elizabethan Themes in *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, 238.
- Arnold, Matthew. See Jump, J. D. (revd.).
- Auchinleck *Life of Adam and Eve*, The. See Bliss, A. J. (note).
- Ault, Norman. See Pope, Alexander, *Minor Poems*.
- Austen, Jane, *Minor Works*, ed. R. W. Chapman, revd., 88.
- Axelrad, A. José, *Unmalcontent élizéthain: John Marston*, revd., 308.
- Ballads. See Montgomerie, William (art.).
- Bateson, F. W., *Wordsworth—a Re-interpretation*, revd., 90.
- Beaty, Frederick L., note by, Two Manuscript Poems of Coleridge, 185.
- Beer, E. S. de, note by, Historical Allusions in *Absalom and Achitophel* [with comment by James Kinsley], 410.
- Bentley, G. E., Jr., art. by, Blake, Hayley, and Lady Hesketh, 264.
- Bertram, James, note by, The ending of Clough's *Dipsychus*, 59.
- Bible, The Wycliffe. See Fristedt, Sven L. (revd.).
- Blake, William. See Bentley, G. E., Jr. (art.).
- Bliss, A. J., note by, *The Auchinleck Life of Adam and Eve*, 406.
- Bolgar, R. R., *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries*, revd., 300.
- Bostock, J. Knight, *A Handbook on Old High German Literature*, noticed, 330.
- Bowers, Fredson. See Dekker, Thomas.
- Bowra, C. M., *Inspiration and Poetry*, revd., 326.
- British Academy, *Proceedings*, Vol. xxxviii, noticed, 108; Vol. xxxix, revd., 328.
- Brook, G. L., *Introduction to Old English*, revd., 188.
- Brown, Beatrice Daw, Heningham, Eleanor K., and Utley, Francis Lee (edd.), *Ninth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400* noticed, 105.
- Browning, Robert. See Harrison, Thomas P. (art.); Federle, Walter (noticed).
- Bruce, Dorothy Hart. See Cranfill, Thomas M.
- Bunyan, John. See Sharrock, Roger (revd.).
- Butt, John. See Pope, Alexander, *Minor Poems*.

- Buxton, John, *Sir Philip Sidney and The English Renaissance*, revd., 69.
- Byron, George, Lord. See Spencer, Terence (revd.).
- Chapman, R. W. See Austen, Jane, *Minor Works*.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. See Schaar, Claes (noticed).
- Clark, Harry Hayden (ed.), *Transitions in American Literary History*, revd., 100.
- Clark, William Smith, *The Early Irish Stage*, revd., 205.
- Clemen, Wolfgang, *Die Tragödie vor Shakespeare*, revd., 304.
- Clough, Arthur, *Dipsychus*. See Bertram, James (note).
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. See Beaty, Frederick L. (note); Schneider, Elisabeth; Whalley, George (revd.).
- Conrad, Joseph, *Nostromo*. See Vidan, Ivo (art.).
- Contarini, Cardinal Gaspar, *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice*. See Muir, Kenneth (note).
- Cooper, Christopher, *English Teacher*, ed. Bertil Sundby, revd., 77.
- Cranfill, Thomas M., and Bruce, Dorothy Hart, *Barnaby Rich*, noticed, 105.
- Crashaw, Richard. See Esch, Arno (revd.).
- Dalrymple, David, Lord Hailes. See Percy, Thomas.
- Dekker, Thomas, *The Dramatic Works of T. D.*, Vol. ii, ed. Fredson Bowers, revd., 306.
- Derolez, R., *Runica Manuscripta. The English Tradition*, revd., 61.
- 'Devonshire Manuscript.' See Seaton, Ethel (note).
- Dobrée, Bonamy. See Mandeville, Bernard, *A Letter to Dion*.
- Dobson, E. J., note by, *The Word Feud*, 52.
- Dobsons Drie Bobbes*, ed. E. A. Horsman, revd., 309.
- Donne, John, 'Epithalamion made at Lincoln's Inn'. See Novarr, David (art.).
- *Donne: Poèmes Choisis*, tr. Pierre Legouis, revd., 310.
- See Esch, Arno; Hunt, Clay (revd.).
- Doran, Madeleine, *Endeavors of Art: a Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama*, revd., 73.
- Dryden, John, *Absalom and Achitophel*. See Beer, E. S. de (note); *Annus Mirabilis*. See Kinsley, James (art.).
- See Frost, William (revd.).
- Dunning, C. M., T. P., art. by, *The Structure of the B-Text of Piers Plowman*, 225.
- Eckhoff, Lorentz, *Shakespeare, Spokesman of the Third Estate*, revd., 420.
- Eliot, George, *The G. E. Letters*, Vols. i-iii, ed. Gordon S. Haight, revd., 435.
- See Rust, James D. (art.).
- English Historical Documents*. Vol. i (c. 500-1042), ed. Dorothy Whitelock, revd., 416.
- Esch, Arno, *Englische religiöse Lyrik des 17. Jahrhunderts. Studien zu Donne, Herbert, Crashaw, Vaughan*, revd., 310.
- Evans, Joan, *John Ruskin*, revd., 96.
- Falconer, A. F. See Percy, Thomas.
- Federle, Walter, *Robert Brownings dramatisches Experiment*, noticed, 107.
- Flasdieck, H. M., *Pall Mall: Beiträge zur Etymologie und Quantitätstheorie*, revd., 189.
- Fristedt, Sven L., *The Wycliffe Bible, Part I*, revd., 194.
- Frost, William, *Dryden and the Art of Translation*, revd., 316.
- Gay, John. See Armens, Sven M. (revd.).
- Gittings, Robert, *John Keats: The Living Year*, revd., 92.
- Gray, Thomas. See Ketton-Cremer, R. W. (revd.).
- Graziani, R. I. C., note by, Ben Jonson's *Chloridia: Fame and her Attendants*, 56.
- Greene, D. J., art. by, Johnson's Contributions to the *Literary Magazine*, 367.
- Haight, Gordon S. See Eliot, George.
- Hamilton, A. C., art. by, Sidney and Agrippa, 151.
- Harrison, Thomas P., art. by, *Birds in the Poetry of Browning*, 393.
- Hart, E. F., art. by, *The Answer-Poem of the Early Seventeenth Century*, 19.
- Hartman, Geoffrey H., *The Unmediated Vision. An Interpretation of Wordsworth, Hopkins, Rilke and Valéry*, revd., 436.
- Hayley, William. See Bentley, G. E., Jr. (art.).
- Heningham, Eleanor K. See Brown, Beatrice Daw.
- Herbert, George. See Esch, Arno (revd.).
- Herrick, Marvin T., *Tragicomedy: its origin and development in Italy, France and England*, revd., 427.
- Hesketh, Lady Harriet. See Bentley, G. E., Jr. (art.).
- Hilton, Walter. See Hussey, S. S. (art.).
- Holden, William P., *Anti-Puritan Satire 1572-1642*, revd., 429.
- Honigmann, E. J. See Shakespeare, William, *King John*.
- Hoover, Benjamin Beard, *Samuel Johnson's Parliamentary Reporting*, revd., 433.
- Hopkins, Gerard Manley. See Hartman, Geoffrey H. (revd.).

- Horsman, E. A. See *Dobsons Drie Bobbes*.
 Hughes, Thomas, *The Misfortunes of Arthur*. See Armstrong, William A. (art.).
 Humphrey, Robert, *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel*, revd., 325.
 Humphreys, A. R., *The Augustan World*, revd., 82.
 Hunt, Clay, *Donne's Poetry*, revd., 310.
 Hussey, S. S., art. by, Langland, Hilton, and the Three Lives, 132.
 Hutchinson, Sara. See Whalley, George (revd.).
 James I of Scotland. See Preston, John (art.).
 Johnson, Samuel. See Greene, D. J. (art.); Hoover, Benjamin Beard (revd.).
 Johnston, George Burke. See Jonson, Benjamin.
 Jonson, Benjamin, *Chloridia*. See Graziani, R. I. C. (note); *Poems*, ed. George Burke Johnston, noticed, 214.
 Jump, J. D., *Matthew Arnold*, revd., 323.
 Kaiser, Rolf (ed.), *Alt- und Mittelenglische Anthologie*, noticed, 104.
 Karlberg, Göran, *The English Interrogative Pronouns*, revd., 299.
 Keats, John. See Gittings, Robert (revd.).
 Kermode, Frank, note by, Definitions of Love, 183.
 — See Shakespeare, William, *The Tempest*.
 Ketton-Cremer, R. W., *Thomas Gray. A Biography*, revd., 318.
 Kingis Quair, *The*. See Preston, John (art.).
 Kinsley, James, art. by, The 'Three Glorious Victories' in *Annus Mirabilis*, 30.
 — See Beer, E. S. de.
 Landa, Louis A., *Swift and the Church of Ireland*, revd., 202.
 Landor, Walter Savage. See Super, R. H. (revd.).
 Langland, William, *Piers Plowman*. See Dunning, C. M., T. P. (art.); Hussey, S. S. (art.).
 Leary, Lewis (ed.), *Motive and Method in 'The Cantos' of Ezra Pound*, noticed, 440.
 Legouis, Pierre. See Donne, John (revd.).
 Lehnert, M., *Altenglisches Elementarbuch*, revd., 188.
 Lewis, C. S., *De Descriptione Temporum*, noticed, 217.
 — *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century excluding Drama*, revd., 195.
 Lewkenor, Sir Lewis, tr. Contarini, *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice*. See Muir, Kenneth (note).
 Literary Magazine. See Greene, D. J. (art.).
 Locke, Louis G., Tillotson. *A Study in Seventeenth Century Literature*, revd., 199.
 Love, Nicholas, *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesu Christ*. See Zeeman, Elizabeth (art.).
 Macdonald, A. See Periodical Literature.
 Malory, Sir Thomas, *The Tale of the Death of King Arthur*, ed. Eugène Vinaver, noticed, 330.
 Mandeville, Bernard, *A Letter to Dion*, ed. Bonamy Dobrée, revd., 81.
 Marston, John. See Axelrad, A. José; Pellegrini, Giuliano (revd.).
 Marvell, Andrew, 'The Definition of Love'. See Kermode, Frank (note).
 Meader, William G., *Courtship in Shakespeare*, noticed, 439.
 Milton, John, First Sonnet on his Blindness. See Robins, Harry F. (art.); see Allen, Don Cameron (noticed).
 Misfortunes of Arthur, *The*. See Armstrong, William A. (art.).
 Montemayor, Jorge de, *Diana*. See Anderson, D. M. (note).
 Montgomerie, William, art. by, Sir Walter Scott as Ballad Editor, 158.
 Monthly Review. See Nangle, Benjamin Christie (revd.).
 Muir, Kenneth, note by, Shakespeare and Lewkenor, 182.
 Munby, A. N. L., *The Formation of the Philipps Library up to the Year 1840*, revd., 211.
 Musgrove, S., note by, The Nomenclature of *King Lear*, 294.
 Musique et poésie au xvi^e siècle, noticed, 332.
 Nangle, Benjamin Christie, *The 'Monthly Review'. Second Series, 1790-1815. Indexes of Contributors and Articles*, revd., 320.
 Novarr, David, art. by, Donne's 'Epithalamion made at Lincoln's Inn': Context and Date, 250.
 Novello Cowden Clarke Collection, *The*, noticed, 440.
 Ojala, Aatos, *Aestheticism and Oscar Wilde*, Part I, noticed, 215.
 Onions, C. T., note by, 'Die and Live', 174.
 Pantin, W. A., *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century*, revd., 418.
 Pellegrini, Giuliano, *Barocco Inglese; Il Teatro di John Marston*, revd., 198.
 Percy, Thomas, *The Percy Letters. The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes*, ed. A. F. Falconer, revd., 86.
 Periodical Literature, Summary of, by A. Macdonald, 108, 218, 333, 441.
 Person, Henry A. (ed.), *Cambridge Middle English Lyrics*, revd., 68.

- Philipps, Sir Thomas. See Munby, A. N. L. (revd.).
 Poel, William. See Speaight, Robert (revd.).
 Pope, Alexander, *Minor Poems*, ed. Norman Ault, completed John Butt, revd., 83.
 Pound, Ezra. See Leary, Lewis (noticed).
 Preston, John, art. by, *Fortunys Exiltree. A Study of The Kingis Quair*, 339.
 Publications Received, List of, 222, 445.
 Quirk, Randolph, *The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry*, revd., 64.
 Ramus, Petrus. See Smith, A. J. (art.).
 Rich, Barnaby. See Cranfill, Thomas M. (noticed).
 Rigby, Marjory, note by, *The Green Knight Shoeless Again*, 173.
 Rilke, Rainer Maria. See Hartman, Geoffrey H. (revd.).
 Robins, Harry F., art. by, *Milton's First Sonnet on his Blindness*, 360.
 Ross, Malcolm Mackenzie, *Poetry and Dogma*, revd., 437.
 Rostvig, Maren-Sofie, *The Happy Man. Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal 1600-1700*, noticed, 215.
 Ruskin, John. See Evans, Joan (revd.).
 Rust, James D., art. by, *The Art of Fiction in George Eliot's Reviews*, 164.
 Schaar, Claes, *Some Types of Narrative in Chaucer's Poetry*, noticed, 214.
 Schneider, Elisabeth, *Coleridge, Opium and Kubla Khan*, revd., 207.
 Scott, Sir Walter. See Montgomerie, William (art.).
 Seaton, Ethel, note by, 'The Devonshire Manuscript' and its Medieval Fragments, 55.
 Shakespeare, William. *King John*, ed. E. J. Honigmann (Arden), revd., 421; *King Lear*. See Musgrove, S. (note); *Othello*. See Muir, Kenneth (note); *The Tempest*, ed. Frank Kermode (Arden), revd., 75. See Eckhoff, Lorentz; Spencer, Terence (revd.); Meader, William; Sprague, A. C. (noticed).
 Sharrock, Roger, *John Bunyan*, revd., 201.
 Sidney, Sir Philip. See Hamilton, A. C. (art.); Buxton, John (revd.).
 Simpson, Percy, *Studies in Elizabethan Drama*, revd., 423.
Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. See Rigby, Marjory (note).
 Sisam, Kenneth, art. by, *Canterbury, Lichfield, and the Vespasian Psalter*, 1, 113.
 Smith, A. J., art. by, *An Examination of some Claims for Ramism*, 348.
 Snorri Sturluson, *Prose Edda*. See Young, Jean I. (revd.).
 Speaight, Robert, *William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival*, revd., 97.
 Spencer, Terence, *Fair Greece, Sad Relic: Literary Philhellenism from Shakespeare to Byron*, revd., 99.
 Sprague, A. C., *The Stage Business in Shakespeare's Plays: a Postscript*, noticed, 106.
 Stene, Aasta, *Hiatus in English*, revd., 63.
 Sundby, Bertil. See Cooper, Christopher, *English Teacher*.
 Super, R. H., *Walter Savage Landor. A Biography*, revd., 94.
 Swift, Jonathan. See Landa, Louis (revd.).
 Thackeray, William Makepeace. See Tillotson, Geoffrey (revd.).
Thomas of Erceuldoune. See Albrecht, William P. (noticed).
 Tillotson, Geoffrey, *Thackeray the Novelist*, revd., 209.
 Tillotson, John. See Locke, Louis G. (revd.).
 Ure, Peter, art. by, *Yeats's Supernatural Songs*, 38.
 Utley, Francis Lee. See Brown, Beatrice Daw.
 Valéry, Paul. See Hartman, Geoffrey H. (revd.).
 Vaughan, Henry. See Esch, Arno (revd.).
 Vespasian Psalter, The. See Sisam, Kenneth (art.).
 Vidan, Ivo, art. by, *One Source of Conrad's Nostromo*, 287.
 Vinaver, Eugène. See Malory, Sir Thomas (noticed).
 Whalley, George, *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson and the Asra Poems*, revd., 321.
 Whitelock, Dorothy. See *English Historical Documents*.
 Wilde, Oscar. See Ojala, Aatos (noticed).
 Wilkins, Ernest Hatch, *A History of Italian Literature*, noticed, 216.
 Wilson, Sir Thomas, tr. *Montemayor's Diana*. See Anderson, D. M. (note).
 Wimsatt, W. K., *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*, 102.
 Wordsworth, William. See Bateson, F. W.; Hartman, Geoffrey, H. (revd.).
 Yeats, W. B. See Ure, Peter (art.).
 Young, Jean I., tr. *The Prose Edda of Snorri Sturluson. Introduced by Sigurdur Nordal*, revd., 192.
 Zandvoort, R. W., *Collected Papers*, noticed, 217.
 Zeeman, Elisabeth, art. by, *Punctuation in an Early Manuscript of Love's Mirror*, 11.

ic:
are

in
ed,

d.,

er,

A

l.).

See

ht,

ist,

G.

ral

rice

H.

l.).

am,

id's

mas

ara

vd.,

ical

d).

dian

or's

dies

W.;

norri

dal,

bers,

tion

ove's

BARTLETT'S FAMILIAR QUOTATIONS

This thirteenth and Centennial edition—completely revised—contains 1,068 pages of quotations and the index nearly 113,500 entries. Among the authors who make their first appearance in the new *Bartlett* are William Faulkner, Adlai Stevenson, Christopher Fry, and Dylan Thomas. 50s.

WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY

This edition of Webster's famous *New World Dictionary* is an entirely new work, in which every entry has been written afresh in the light of contemporary linguistics, psychology, and the allied sciences. Comprising 1,716 pages, there are 142,000 entries, and 1,200 specially prepared illustrations. 70s.

MACMILLAN & CO. LTD.

CURRENT PERIODICAL SERIES

PUBLICATION NO.: 1200

TITLE: REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME: 8

ISSUES: 29-32

DATE: February, May, August, November 1957

This publication is reproduced by agreement with the publisher. Extensive duplication or resale without permission is prohibited.

University Microfilms, London